

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 19, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, look down with Thy fatherly pity and care and love upon us this day. In the midst of all the strife and turmoil of life we believe there is a hand of divine providence that guides the affairs of men. We would seek fellowship with Thee that we may be seen to live in harmony with the divine plan, not against God. All men are in Thy heart. Thou dost desire the happiness, Thou dost will the prosperity, of Thy children. Thou dost stand guard over the rights of men, and there is no respect of persons with Thee.

Give to us fellowship of humanity with a sense of our obligations to men, that we may under God's direction work out a nation's place whose ministry will be the ministry of a universal brotherhood. For Christ's sake, Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE LIVE-STOCK INDUSTRY.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a telegram from Mr. Frank J. Hagenbarth, president of the National Wool Growers' Association, that I desire to have printed in the Record, as it refers to pending legislation. I do not ask that it be read.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE, UTAH, January 18, 1915.

Senator REED SMOOT,

Washington, D. C.:

We yesterday wired WALSH, WARREN, Public Lands Committee of Senate, and MONDELL and Public Lands Committee of House, as follows:

"The National Wool Growers' Association has appointed a committee to meet a similar committee from the American National Live-Stock Association for the purpose of making recommendations relative to all public-land bills now before Congress. These recommendations can not be formulated before February 1, and we therefore respectfully request that no legislation affecting our public domain shall be enacted until we have had an opportunity to present our recommendations. We are not opposed to additional legislation, but as the largest users of the public domain feel that it is our duty to make certain recommendations to Congress. Will you therefore help delay legislation until these recommendations have been made?"

We received the following reply from WALSH to-day:

"Utterly impossible for me to comply with request of your telegram. Pending public-land legislation must have attention now or never. During session military and revenue legislation with shipping measure will crowd out everything else after February 1. Suggest you get here without delay."

Stockmen are not opposed to enlarged homestead law. On contrary, they favor such enactment surrounded by proper and practical safeguards. Stockmen do not contend for any supremacy on public domain, but demand as American citizens and taxpayers having some rights as such that they be heard by Public Lands Committee of Senate on legislation which seriously affects them. Every possible effort is being made to have proper committees representative of live-stock industry appear before Senate Lands Committee. Physically impossible to have such committees reach Washington before 1st of February. In view of situation we feel that request for such necessary reasonable delay should be granted, and we appeal to you in your representative capacity to take such consistent action as may be necessary in the premises. Please advise us promptly.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
F. J. HAGENBARTH, President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Daniel H. Sawyer, of Plymouth, N. H., praying that mediation be proposed to the European belligerents, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of John W. Fowler, of Henniker, N. H., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Concord, N. H., and a petition of Dr. and Mrs. T. M. Dillingham, of Marlboro, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of Local Branch, Maine State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Auburn, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Earl Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Earlville, Ill., praying for the exemption of farmers' mutual insurance companies from the provisions of the

income-tax law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Stratford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of William McKinley Camp, No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, of Norwalk, Conn., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Broad Brook Co., of Broad Brook; the Russell Manufacturing Co., of Middletown; and the Ensign-Bickford Co., of Simsbury, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1810) for the relief of Johannes T. Jensen, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 48) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1376) for the relief of Peter McKay, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 49) thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3357) for the relief of Thomas Coyle and Bridget Coyle and their legal representatives, submitted an adverse report (No. 50) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HARDING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2231) for the relief of Alice H. Gilson, submitted an adverse report (No. 51) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 2696) to authorize the President to award a medal of honor to Dr. John T. Nagle for conspicuous bravery at the Battle of Kernstown, Va., on July 24, 1864, while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6) authorizing issuance of patent for certain lands to Thomas L. Griffiths, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 52) thereon.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 795) for the relief of Edward Erickson, submitted an adverse report (No. 53) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

WITHDRAWAL OF MAPS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. From the Committee on the Geological Survey I report favorably the following order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate and directed to transfer to the United States Geological Survey the following described maps:

Map of the Territory of New Mexico, made by Lieuts. J. W. Albert and W. G. Peck, 1846-47. This map was issued to accompany Lieut. Albert's report on New Mexico, of which the survey library has a copy which lacks the map.

Chart of St. Clair Flats (Mississippi River). Bureau of Topographic Engineers, 1857.

Territory of Florida from its northern boundary to Lat. 27° 30' N., connected with delta of Mississippi. Board of Internal Improvement, February 19, 1829.

Map of Oregon and Upper California, to accompany the report of J. C. Fremont, 1848. The survey library has a copy of the report lacking the map.

D. Esteban Pichardo's geographical and topographical map of Cuba, November 27, 1873. Incomplete; 2 sheets only.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill (S. 3580) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., and the bill (S. 3581) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., were introduced by me January 17 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask that that committee be discharged from

the further consideration of the bills, and that they be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. Bills identical with these were submitted to the Public Lands Committee in the second session of the Sixty-third Congress, reported favorably, and passed the Senate March 12, 1914, but failed to pass the House. I was mistaken in asking for the reference of the bills to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING FOR THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. On December 17, 1915, I reported, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, resolution No. 35, submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], granting authority to print and bind certain papers and documents for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it was placed on the calendar. The report was made through an inadvertence on my part and I ask to withdraw it, the resolution having in the first instance been referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be withdrawn.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 3686) granting an increase of pension to Gilman P. Lombard;

A bill (S. 3687) granting an increase of pension to Arthur G. Sawyer;

A bill (S. 3688) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius T. Ham;

A bill (S. 3689) granting an increase of pension to Henry Quint;

A bill (S. 3690) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Norton;

A bill (S. 3691) granting a pension to Charles E. Williams;

A bill (S. 3692) granting a pension to Theodore S. Black;

A bill (S. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Cook;

A bill (S. 3694) granting an increase of pension to Mariner Smith;

A bill (S. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Morrison Young; and

A bill (S. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Colcord; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 3697) for the relief of Charles V. Wells (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Applegate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3699) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the powder-house lot; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 3700) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3701) granting a pension to William A. Bowen; and

A bill (S. 3702) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. C. Kaigler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3703) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission for utilization of water power at locks and dams constructed by the Government on navigable rivers of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3704) to establish a landschaft system of rural credit in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3705) to establish a preparatory military academy at or near Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3706) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a commerce court, and to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 3707) granting an increase of pension to William F. Wiley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3708) granting an increase of pension to Josephine F. Stowe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3709) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shoemaker;

A bill (S. 3710) granting an increase of pension to Nathan L. Stockwell;

A bill (S. 3711) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Lockhart;

A bill (S. 3712) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sausaman;

A bill (S. 3713) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Myers;

A bill (S. 3714) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Nash;

A bill (S. 3715) granting an increase of pension to Helen Hogan; and

A bill (S. 3716) granting a pension to Byron E. Gifford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 3717) granting an increase of pension to Bernard McNaney; and

A bill (S. 3718) granting a pension to Willie Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3719) granting a pension to Maurice H. Myers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3720) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to license cotton warehouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

RELATIONS WITH MEXICO.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, whether any convention, agreement, or understanding has been concluded, entered into, or arrived at with any South American or Central American Governments concerning Mexico, and especially if any relations have been established or obligations assumed by the executive department on behalf of the United States that require this Government to obtain the consent or request of any such South American or Central American Governments before employing its Army and Navy to protect American citizens or other aliens in Mexico.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee at any time, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of a subcommittee; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

MARY MEYER.

Mr. HARDING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 75), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Mary Meyer, niece of Jacob C. Donaldson, late a skilled laborer in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LECTURE BY HENRY J. PIERCE.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have here an address delivered by Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., on the necessity for water-power development. It deals with a question the Senate will have under consideration very shortly, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the nature of the document?

Mr. JONES. It is an address delivered by Henry J. Pierce on the necessity for water-power development. It gives some very interesting matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator state where the address was delivered?

Mr. JONES. It was delivered in the auditorium of the New National Museum last evening.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the Senator read the address?

Mr. JONES. I heard the address.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not know about the length of the address. We are putting a great many things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which, it seems to me, ought not to go there, and it will make a very expensive publication. I was wondering whether the Senator from Washington would not be satisfied to have the address printed as a public document.

Mr. JONES. I would much rather have it printed in the RECORD than to have it printed as a document, because if printed as a document we can never find it and if printed in the RECORD we know that we can find it somewhere.

It is not a very long address. It refers to a matter that will be pending before the Senate very shortly. I am no more in favor of cumbering the RECORD with many things than is the Senator, and I do not think I do it, but this is one thing that I think is useful and will be useful to Senators.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for just a statement?

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands that the address is a valuable one, and I am inclined to think from the information I have obtained that it ought to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think myself it is all right to have it available. The question in my mind is about cumbering the RECORD. I see no difficulty about getting access to it if it is printed as a Senate document. A certain number of those documents go to each Senator, and they are available undoubtedly. The address is on an important subject; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. I hope the Senator from Florida will not object to the printing of this address in the RECORD. It has a direct bearing on an important subject which is coming before Congress. I am familiar with the address; it is not long, and I think if it could be read by the Senator he would not object to its being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will not object further, Mr. President, under the circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The address is as follows:

THE NECESSITY FOR WATER POWER DEVELOPMENT.

(By Henry J. Pierce.)

It is a strange fact that the proportion of our total available water power thus far developed is only about the same as was the proportion of our agricultural lands under cultivation 100 years ago, at which time the development of our natural resources had not been commenced. To-day, while practically all the farming lands of the United States with the exception of the arid portions of the West have been brought

under cultivation, and while such great natural resources as coal, oil, phosphate, and minerals have been developed as rapidly as necessity required, yet but 10 per cent of our available water power has been utilized.

Up to 1885, when electricity first came into use for practical purposes, the use of water power was limited to the turning of wheels for operation of a few grist mills and other manufacturing establishments. During the 30-year period between 1885 and 1915, 6,000,000 horsepower was developed out of a total available amount of 61,678,000 horsepower. As the principal use for electric energy has been the operation of public utilities, the water powers thus far utilized have been those located at points nearest large centers of population, though in some instances power is being economically transmitted in large quantities for distances of from 150 to 200 miles.

The United States Geological Survey estimates that 44,049,000 horsepower, or 71 per cent of the total potential available horsepower in the United States, is contained within the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada, and of this vast amount but 1,622,021 horsepower, or 3.68 per cent, is now being utilized.

The total available water power of all countries of Europe combined is 35,965,000 horsepower, the development of which is rapidly progressing.

Three great principal uses for electric energy await the development of our water powers: The operation of pumping plants in connection with irrigation projects; the electrification of railroads; for manufacturing purposes in production of fertilizers, explosives, and electrochemicals, wood pulp, paper, iron, steel, etc.

IRRIGATION.

It is estimated that there are at least 10,000,000 acres of arid lands located in the far Western States, lying above the reach of gravity water, that can only be reclaimed through water raised by pumps operated by the cheap hydroelectric power now latent and wasting in the various streams from which the water would be pumped. Thus the land, and at a lower level the water to irrigate it, and the power to raise the water to the land are often all assembled at one point. Given water, these lands will produce every fruit, vegetable, and grain that is native to the Temperate Zone, and are capable of supporting a population of 2,000,000 people. If capital can be safeguarded, it is safe to say that hundreds of thousands of water horsepower will be utilized within the next 10 years in connection with the reclamation of arid lands, and that, in addition to what the Government service will accomplish, hundreds of millions of dollars of private capital will be used for the establishment of reclamation projects in connection with pumping plants. Lands are being irrigated in 27 States, and as far east as New Jersey and Florida, and two Western States have now nearly 5,000,000 acres of land under irrigation.

ELECTRIFICATION OF RAILROADS.

Four hundred and fifty miles of the main line of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, being the portion between Harlowton, Mont., and Avery, Idaho, is now being equipped for operation by electricity. Quoting from the testimony given before the Senate Public Lands Committee in 1914 by John D. Ryan, a director of the Milwaukee Railroad, and also president of the Montana Power Co., which will furnish the power:

"The railroad will pay under the contract for power delivered over 450 miles of its road something like \$550,000 a year. It is paying now for coal to operate its steam trains over the same line approximately \$1,750,000, and they furnish their own coal from mines on their own road, and one-third of their equipment is used in hauling coal to themselves, whereas with electric power there is not any such waste. It will save coal in the ground and an enormous amount of money, and will be utilizing an absolutely waste product."

Mr. Ryan testified that the Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railroad is paying \$96,000 per year for electric energy to operate 80 miles of road, as against a former cost for coal of \$270,000, a saving of \$174,000 annually.

In view of the great and apparently sure economical success of the electrification of 450 miles of the Milwaukee line, it is almost certain that within the next 10 years a majority of the railroads operating through the mountainous country of the far West, where hydroelectric power can be developed cheaply, will adopt electricity as motive power. Forty-eight thousand seven hundred miles of railroad are now being operated in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada. It is estimated that 10,000 horsepower is needed to operate 100 miles of single track, and therefore it will require 4,870,000 horsepower to electrify all of the railroads of these States, or one-ninth of the total hydroelectric power possible to develop in the territory traversed by these railroads. A great portion of the trackage is over mountain divisions, and the use of electricity in place of coal will result in great economy of operation, obviate the danger of forest fires, and by elimination of noise and smoke and through a more generous ventilation, which will be possible when the flying cinder need no longer be taken into account, will make travel far more comfortable than at present. As the railroads consume 20 per cent of the total coal used for all purposes, the substitution of electricity for coal as motive power will conserve this enormous amount of fuel for future use and water power wasted from the beginning of time will be utilized.

PRODUCTION OF FIXED NITROGEN.

The greatest need for the development of our water powers is the imperative necessity, and it is a national necessity, that sufficient fixed nitrogen should be produced within the boundaries of the United States to meet its requirements. Nitrogen comprises four-fifths of the atmosphere and is a constituent of all organized life and tissues. It is a colorless, tasteless, odorless, gaseous, nonmetallic element. We live in it, we breathe it, we eat it, and it constitutes a portion of our human frame. It is absolutely necessary to the existence of animal and plant life. Without fixed nitrogen the earth would soon become an uninhabited desert waste. While the atmosphere contains an exhaustless supply of nitrogen, it being estimated that 20,000,000 tons exist above each square mile of the earth's surface, yet 90 per cent of the plant life that lives in it does not absorb it, and the remaining 10 per cent absorbs but a small proportion of that which it requires. The world has been dependent for most of its supplies of fixed nitrogen upon the nitrate of soda beds of Chile, where, during some convulsion of nature at some remote past time, the soda absorbed quantities of nitrogen from the air. During 1913 the United States imported

625,000 tons of Chilean nitrates, valued at \$21,000,000, upon which the Chilean export duty was 60 per cent. We thus paid to the Chilean Government \$12,600,000, which may be considered merely a part of the amount which the people of the United States pay for its policy of water-power stagnation. In other words, the people of this country would be quite as well off as they now are if they granted a subsidy or bonus of \$12,600,000 per annum for the establishment of the water-power nitrogen industry in the United States. The richest nitrate beds of Chile, however, will be practically exhausted by 1923; and were it not for the discovery of processes whereby it is now possible, with the aid of electric energy, to obtain supplies of fixed nitrogen from the atmosphere, the world would stand in imminent deadly peril and the perpetuation of the human race would be endangered. It is a wonderful providence that perpetual and inexhaustible supplies of nitrogen may be obtained from the atmosphere by the use of electric energy obtained from our water powers whose flow is also everlasting, and that thus the limited supplies of coal and other fuels laid aside by nature may be conserved for other uses.

The governmental paralysis imposed seven years ago upon the development of water powers in the United States through the restrictive interpretation of Federal laws still continues, but that period has been one of great hydroelectric development in Europe, where over 1,200,000 water horsepower has been utilized for the extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere, while the United States out of 61,000,000 horsepower is not using a single horsepower for that purpose. Hydroelectric nitrogen plants have been established in Norway, Sweden, Germany, Australia, Italy, Switzerland, France, Spain, Japan, and Canada, but none in the United States. The nitrogen industry of Europe represents an aggregate investment of over \$300,000,000, employs 50,000 people, and the annual value of its products and derivatives is upward of \$220,000,000. In Germany, where practically all the water powers have been developed, a nitrogen plant is being built which will use 100,000 horsepower, to be produced from cheap coal. England is seriously considering the development of 1,000,000 water horsepower in Iceland to provide for her future supplies of nitrogen. Thus, with a foresight that is a reproach to our intelligence and enterprise, these other countries are insuring their requirements of this great human necessity against the time when it will be no longer possible to obtain supplies from Chile. It seems incredible that nothing has been done thus far toward the establishment of the nitrogen industry in the United States. Several years ago an effort was made to locate an atmospheric nitrogen plant upon the Coosa River in Alabama, where a large water power would have been developed, and near which were ample supplies of the necessary raw materials—high-grade limestones and cheaply mined coking coal. The plant, moreover, would have been located in the center of the cotton belt, where the most of its product would have been marketed in the form of fertilizer. As development capital could not be obtained under our restrictive Federal water-power laws, a bill was introduced in Congress to meet the requirements of the case, but failed to become a law, and, as a result, the plant was established at Niagara Falls, Canada, where a contract was obtained for electric energy at a low figure. As a result, the United States has lost and Canada gained a great manufacturing institution, covering an investment of millions of dollars, and the farmers of Alabama are paying the freight on its product from Canada to their cotton fields. In anticipation of a change in our Federal water-power laws a company was projected during the winter of 1914-15 which expected to build nitrogen plants in the South and on the Pacific coast which would have cost upward of \$35,000,000, but owing to the failure of the Sixty-third Congress to enact practical legislation the attention of the organizers has been turned toward the development of Canadian water powers. It is estimated that an investment of \$860,000,000 would be necessary to produce mechanically from the atmosphere as much nitrogen as Chile's nitrate deposits yield every year, and this shows the enormous possibilities for the future contained in the establishment of this entirely new industry in the United States.

The two largest and most necessary uses for nitrogen are in connection with the manufacture of fertilizers and explosives. Seven million tons of fertilizer, valued at \$170,000,000, were sold in the United States during 1913, and for its manufacture over \$40,000,000 of nitrogenous and other material was imported, most of which could have been made in this country, with the aid of electricity. The average amount of fertilizer used in the United States is 28 pounds per acre of cultivated lands, against 200 pounds per acre in Europe, with the following results:

Comparison of average yield per acre in bushels of crops in the United States and Europe:

	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Rye.	Potatoes.
Europe.....	32	47	38	30	158
United States.....	15	29	25	16	96

If our use of fertilizer had been equal to one-half of that of Europe per acre in 1913, 24,000,000 tons would have been required, of the value of \$580,000,000, and in the production of which 12,000,000 water horsepower must have been utilized, and the resultant increase of crop value would have exceeded \$2,000,000,000.

Careful and extensive experiments made in Germany have shown that by the addition annually of 150 pounds of nitrogen per acre, crops of rye, wheat, oats, barley, and potatoes are more than doubled, and the reports of the German agricultural department show that, as the result of feeding the soil with 2,000,000 tons of nitrates, the increase of crops amounted to 63,000,000 tons. These figures show how important is the rôle actually played by nitrogen in the cereal production of Europe. The German farmer practically uses his land as an agent for transforming fertilizer into products, while the American farmer tries to get products out of his starving land without feeding it sufficient plant food. European nations waste nothing, and in many clever ways create values out of what we discard as worthless. Our comparatively young country is wasting its resources with terrible profligacy, as is evidenced by our using up our stores of coal and oil instead of utilizing our wasting water powers.

The crops harvested annually in the United States abstract over 1,000,000 tons of nitrogen from the soil, and as the world's supply of combined nitrogen is increased only slowly and in small degrees by nature, the soil of farmed lands is entirely dependent upon fertilizer for replenishment of the stock of nitrogen which it gives up in its yield of crops.

At the agricultural station at Rothamsted, England, wheat has been grown year after year on the same land for 63 seasons without fertilizer, with an average crop return of 12 bushels per acre, while during 10 years the average crop on adjacent plots of ground receiving plant food each year was 40 bushels per acre.

The present method of manufacture produces a finished product containing but 12 per cent of active fertilizer and 88 per cent of utterly useless material on which freight and haulage must be paid by the farmer, whereas the electrofertilizer product contains 60 per cent of fertilizing material. By the electric process not only is nitrogen obtained from the atmosphere, but phosphate rock may now be treated by electricity instead of sulphuric acid for extraction of phosphoric acid.

The use of fertilizer has a most intimate relation to the cost of living, which has increased in this country at a much more rapid rate than it has abroad. The extraordinary increase in the cost of living in the United States has been principally in the cost of food products, while other items than foods have increased at only the general rate prevailing throughout the world. From 1900 to 1910 the cost of foods in the United States increased 35 per cent and abroad only 15 per cent. While our population increased 21 per cent during those 10 years, crop production increased only 10 per cent. The rapid increase in food cost in this country can only be checked by increased crop production, just as food prices are held down in Europe through increase in yields per acre. The countries of highest agricultural development are the largest consumers of fertilizers.

The mutterings of strife for commercial supremacy between England and Germany were heard as far back as early in the nineteenth century; when the value of bones as a plant food becoming realized, the great German chemist, Liebig, was moved to say:

"England is robbing all other countries of their fertility. Already in her eagerness for bones she has turned up the battle fields of Leipsic, of Waterloo, and Crimea. Already from the catacombs of Sicily she has carried away the skeletons of many successive generations. Annually she removes from the shores of other countries to her own the manurial equivalent of three and one-half millions of men."

EXPLOSIVES.

Nitrogen, in the form of nitric acid, is the principal constituent of explosives, such as gun cotton, dynamite, and smokeless powder. We are annually producing about 250,000 tons of explosives, valued at \$40,000,000, and we pay \$23,000,000 for the raw materials that enter into them, most of which are imported. Had it not been for the discovery of the nitrate fields of Chile, the explosive industry, as it is known to-day, would have been impossible, and as coal and minerals could not have been mined without the use of explosives the development in mining and transportation which has characterized the last half century could not have been made.

In case of war we would be almost entirely dependent upon foreign nations for our supply of nitrogen for manufacture of powder, and would be practically defenseless unless we could obtain it from other nations. If the country with whom we were at war should be strong enough to seize the nitrate deposits of Chile, or to prevent shipments to this country, it would leave us helpless, in spite of our 100,000,000 of people and our Army and Navy. We would be forced to commandeer all sources of nitrogen, including fertilizer, and it might come about that some of our agricultural regions could no longer be devoted to food production, even though the scene of conflict never penetrated to them. The War Department is greatly concerned over this weak point in our national defense, and writers who are authorities upon the subject from the military standpoint urge the immediate development of our water powers, and establishment of atmospheric nitrogen plants, in order to insure the production of our requirements of nitrogen within the borders of our own country; and they strongly recommend that the nitrogen plants be so strategically located throughout the country as to be reasonably well protected against attack in case of foreign invasion. Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War, in his last annual report said in vigorous language:

"Our only present source of supply (of nitrogen) is the natural nitrate beds of Chile, which in time of war might be shut off from us. Obviously in the matter of munitions, especially where the source is so limited and localized, we should neglect no provision so easily available as this to make the country self-sustaining. Plants producing nitrogen for industrial purposes in time of peace would be a great national asset in view of their availability to supply us with the necessary nitrogen in time of war."

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, in his last annual report, under the poetic and beautiful caption "Turning water into power," says:

"Then, too, there is that mystifying miracle of drawing nitrogen from the air for chemical use, which can be done only with great power, but is being done in Germany, Norway, Sweden, France, Switzerland, and elsewhere, by which an inexhaustible substitute for the almost exhausted nitrates of Chile has been found. To increase the yield of our farms and to give us an independent and adequate supply of nitrogen for the explosives used in war, we must set water wheels at work that will fix nitrogen in lime."

Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, recently said:

"We are dependent upon foreign sources for nitrogen. Our problem of defense would be greatly simplified if we only possessed our own nitrogen supply."

A recent statement showed that the stock of powder for small arms in possession of the War Department amounted to 200,000,000 pounds, which would only be sufficient in time of battle to last an army of 500,000 men eight days; further, that there is only sufficient ammunition on hand to fire all of our coast defense guns forty times, or continuously for about one hour. The War Department has, for some time, been accumulating a stock of Chilean nitrate to provide for emergencies; but in time of war it would produce only sufficient explosives to last for a short period of time. Germany is shut off from supplies of Chilean nitrate for powder making, and if she had not developed her water powers for the purpose of obtaining nitrogen from the air the European war would be ended to-day and Germany beaten. But the German Government has taken over all nitrogen fixation plants and is operating them on a war basis and thus is enabled to manufacture a plentiful supply of ammunition.

MANUFACTURE OF PAPER AND WOOD PULP.

One-third of the cost of manufacturing wood pulp and paper consists of the cost of power. The imports of these articles into the United States are growing at an enormous rate. Sweden and Canada have been developing their water powers, and hence it is interesting to note

the exports of wood pulp and paper from these countries to the United States:

	1911	1912	1913
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
From Sweden.....	84,378	107,884	130,693
From Canada.....	83,856	131,412	281,586

With the production of cheap electric energy, through the development of our water powers, the pulp and paper industry will come back to its own in the United States. It is inevitable that the industry must spread westward, and that through the utilization of the water powers and the forests of the Northwest, these imports of wood pulp and paper will be displaced with products made in our own country.

MANUFACTURE OF ELECTROMETALLURGICAL PRODUCTS.

While coal, coke, and gas are principally used in the smelting and refining of iron and steel, and while one-fourth of the entire world's output of coal is used for that purpose, yet in 1913, 668,000 tons of steel were produced in Europe and 165,000 tons in the United States, through the use of the electric furnace. In Alabama and Tennessee practically inexhaustible deposits of iron ore and limestone are located in the vicinity of great undeveloped water powers, and when the problem of making pig iron through the use of cheap electricity is solved, in an economical way, the South will become the center of the metallurgical industry. Students of the question believe that the use of cheap hydroelectric power, in the making of iron, will eventually bring about a commercial revolution in the leading nations. The United States, Germany, and England produce seven-eighths of the world's iron. Germany has already developed practically all of her water powers, England has but few, and the production of iron would, therefore, under these circumstances, pass into the hands of the United States because of its water powers and it would become omnipotent in the production of iron and steel. In fact, these authorities believe that all industries which consume large amounts of mechanical energy will be forced to emigrate to countries where water power is abundant.

MANUFACTURE OF CALCIUM CARBIDE.

Over 200,000 homes are lighted by acetylene gas, produced from calcium carbide, in the manufacture of which, at Niagara Falls, great quantities of hydroelectric energy are used. Because of our restrictive water-power laws the American Carbide Co. could not increase its production in this country, and is now building a plant on the seacoast of Norway, where it has contracted for the delivery of 80,000 horsepower developed from water power, and expects to ship most of its product to the United States.

Electrochemical products were reported by the last census to be made in 34 establishments at Niagara Falls of a value of \$18,450,000, consisting of abrasives, electrodes, calcium carbide, caustic soda, chlorates, and such metals and alloys as aluminum, silicon, ferrovanadium, etc.

If all the water at Niagara Falls were utilized it would be possible to generate 5,000,000 horsepower. The American and Canadian Governments permit the use of sufficient water to generate 400,000 horsepower, all of which is in use, and an 80,000 horsepower steam plant, to be operated by coal, is being built on the shores of the Niagara River to provide for further demands for power.

There are many other large and constantly increasing uses for hydroelectric power which can not be enumerated here for lack of time.

With the abolition of our present faulty laws, and the enactment of practical legislation, great water-power developments which have been held back for years would be undertaken on the Connecticut River, where the power would be used in operating the mills of New England; on the Tennessee and Coosa Rivers of the South, in connection with the manufacture of fertilizers, iron, and steel; on the upper reaches of the Mississippi for public-utility uses; and on the Columbia, Snake, and Pend d'Oreille Rivers of the Northwest for irrigation and manufacturing purposes. Through installation of power dams and of locks these rivers will be made navigable for an aggregate of hundreds of miles further into the interior of the country, and it would be accomplished by private capital, without a cent of cost to the people, through Government taxation.

But while an enormous amount of water power is latent in our navigable rivers a far greater amount exists in the nonnavigable streams flowing through the public lands and Federal reserves located in the far Western States. Here nature has segregated her natural resources; the thirsty land awaiting irrigation with the water containing the latent water power washing its shores; the forests necessary to manufacture of wood pulp and paper lining the banks of the falling water; the limestone and phosphate needed for fertilizers and explosives located contiguous to wasting water powers.

It seems almost unbelievable that an enlightened Government like ours should not only fail to encourage, but should blindly bar the way to the development of a great natural resource so important to the farming and manufacturing interests of the country and so necessary to national safety. The fault, however, is not with private enterprise. As has been shown, Americans have repeatedly tried, but in vain, to get the right from our Government to establish hydroelectric plants upon navigable streams or within the Government domain upon fair and equitable terms that would justify the risk and the large expenditure of time and money involved while fully protecting the public interest.

They have been met by impracticable conditions which no prudent man could agree to. Prevented by the laws and policy of their own country from engaging in developing a great natural resource of incalculable value to any country possessing it, they found in other lands the welcome for their enterprise and capital denied to them at home. And so Canada and Norway are now enjoying the advantages of American energy, enterprise, and capital in the successful establishment and operation of great manufacturing plants involving an expenditure of many millions of dollars and giving steady employment to thousands of men.

Backed by the necessary capital, men of business and of technical and scientific experience who have made hydroelectric development their life work, as well as manufacturers of all of the great products for which the hydroelectric energy would be used, stand ready to undertake the development of our now wasting water powers and the other vast commercial features connected with it as soon as our present impossible Federal laws are corrected to a fair business basis, under which practical men will give their time and capital will invest.

Reasonable, sensible, practical regulation safeguarding the public interest no one objects to. But the present situation is not one of regula-

tion, but of strangulation. The trouble is that the Federal policy covering the use of water power is so narrow, so full of restrictions, so loaded down with conditions that no prudent man will venture to embark in the business. It is the case of the would-be banker who mistakes the safety-deposit business for banking and locks up all the money in the vaults and keeps it there unused to the detriment of both the depositors and the public. A natural resource which may not be used might as well not exist.

The belief that any law that Congress may enact will be eagerly accepted by would-be water-power developers and the investors upon whom they are dependent for the means of developing is a delusion, and the sooner it is abandoned the better will be the opportunity for obtaining legislation based upon business principles and business experience. Theories of ideal legislation must be abandoned and some practical measure enacted or hydroelectric development will prove but a dream of the present generation. The investor must know in advance the conditions under which he is to conduct his business, and Federal water-power laws should specifically define the terms and conditions under which permits for use of Government property necessary to the development of water powers shall be issued. This is just as necessary to the guidance of ever-changing heads of Government bureaus in conducting the affairs of their departments as it is to those who would invest their money in the development of our water powers. Little advancement can be expected unless men of ability, experience, and character, and who possess the highest order of technical skill and acumen and organizing, financial, and executive ability can be attracted to and retained in the industry.

To be of effect, Federal legislation governing water-power development must be of a nature to protect the public interest, be fair and business-like toward capital, and place not a featherweight more burden on the operation of water powers located within the public domain than is borne by competing hydroelectric developments operating outside the Federal reserves. There is no reason why these things should not be so coordinated upon a solid business basis as to protect every interest and bring results.

It is apparent that there is vital and imperatively urgent necessity for the enactment of practical Federal water-power legislation of a character which will promote and encourage in every way the development and utilization of the enormous quantity of energy latent in our streams and now wasting to the sea, a necessity in no way local but national. It is necessary for the manufacture of ammunition for the national defense; necessary for the manufacture of fertilizers, that the cost of living may be decreased through increase of crops; necessary for the electrification of railroads for the cheap carrying of freight and to provide a means of rapid and comfortable transportation for the people; necessary to the irrigation of vast tracts of lands, meaning the building of thousands of homes on lands now silent; necessary to the establishment of great and entirely new industries in the United States, meaning the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars, the building of new cities and towns, and the employment of thousands of men and women; necessary if we are to maintain our commercial standing among the manufacturing nations of the earth; and, finally, of vital necessity toward promoting the safety, the comfort, the welfare, and the prosperity of every citizen of the United States.

MINING AND METALLURGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA (S. DOC. NO. 233.)

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate ordered printed as a Senate document excerpts of the minutes of the meeting of the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America. We notice that there are a couple of illustrations, and I therefore ask that those illustrations be printed as a part of the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY HENRY W. FARNAM.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have a copy of an address by Henry W. Farnam, professor of political economy at Yale University, delivered at the ninth annual meeting of the American Association for Labor Legislation, at Washington, D. C., December 28, 1915, upon the seaman's law of 1915. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, with the request that it be published as a Senate document. I understand that it is the practice that it shall go to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 610).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, the date of the approval of the Alaskan Railroad act (38 Stat., 305), to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1916.

NOTE.—Reports and maps accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.

ADMIRAL FLETCHER'S REPORT.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of this morning's Washington Herald, with a paragraph marked, which I wish to have read. It purports to give statements from Admiral Fletcher's report to the Secretary of the Navy, and

there is just enough truth in it to make it false in all essential particulars. The report was sent to the Senate by the Secretary of the Navy, with only such parts left out as, in his opinion, foreigners ought not to know. The Secretary's letter, sent to me and which I have asked to have printed along with it, goes into full details concerning all these matters, and so far from the Democrats of the Senate having suppressed it, we are perfectly willing to have the whole report made public. Indeed, I expected it to be made public, and was surprised when Senator LODGE asked for it to be printed in confidence for use of the Naval Committee. Tennyson tells us—

That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies.

Inasmuch as garbled and misleading extracts from Admiral Fletcher's report are leaking into the press, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed and that the executive document containing both of Admiral Fletcher's reports and the letter of the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the Naval Committee, which was ordered to be printed for the confidential use of the Naval Committee, be given to the press.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I made the request that this report be printed in confidence, but I made it under a misapprehension. I thought that was the desire of the department. I now think there is no possible reason for it being held in confidence, and I join with the Senator from South Carolina in asking that the injunction of secrecy be removed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; the injunction of secrecy is removed, and the document is a public document.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the Secretary to read the statement which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, if there is no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Washington Herald, Jan. 19, 1916.]

MINOR OFFICERS HANDLE TURRETS—ADMIRAL FLETCHER'S REPORT COMPLAINS OF CONDITIONS IN UNITED STATES NAVY.

Sweeping indictment of the shortcomings of the American Navy are set forth in the annual report of Admiral F. F. Fletcher, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, which the Democrats of the Senate have suppressed.

The admiral states that at the June inspection one division alone of the fleet was short 1,350 men. Mine-laying ships, he declares, are 25 per cent below the number of men necessary for their proper operation, and he complains that the department has reduced the complement of the destroyers by 25 per cent.

He states that during the "battle efficiency inspection" of the battleship *Utah*, a chief petty officer was in charge of one turret and an ensign was in charge of another. A pay clerk and a yeoman were in charge of the plotting room on one dreadnaught, doing work of experienced commissioned officers.

MUNITIONS OF WAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further resolutions, morning business is closed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I ask that Senate resolution No. 20 be taken from the table and laid before the Senate for two purposes only: First, that I may submit some observations on it; and, second, that it may be properly referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution referred to by the Senator from Iowa will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 20) submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on December 10, 1915, as follows:

Whereas the profit incident to the manufacture and sale of arms, armament, and munitions of war has a tendency to corrupt public opinion, disturb international peace, and prevent a peaceful settlement of disputes between nations; and inasmuch as it ought to be made impossible for any person or corporation to make money out of war; and inasmuch as the Government should, for its own safety and protection, manufacture all arms, armament, and munitions of war for the equipment, construction, and use of the Army and Navy to the end that it may be independent of individual or corporate interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there shall be appointed by the President of the Senate a committee of five Senators to examine the following matters, to wit:

First. The most feasible plan of acquiring or constructing manufacturing plants of sufficient capacity to supply the Army and Navy with all arms, armament, and munitions of war, including ships and their equipment.

Second. The probable cost of such manufacturing plants, taking into account both present and future military needs.

Third. The proper locations for such manufacturing plants.

Fourth. The necessary legislation to prevent either persons or corporations from engaging or continuing in such manufacture and when such legislation should take effect.

The committee shall take testimony, have the power to administer oaths and to send for persons and papers. The hearings shall be open to the public, and all oral evidence submitted shall be taken down in shorthand and the notes transcribed and made a part of the record of the committee. The expenses of such hearings shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not often address the Senate upon a subject that is not under immediate considera-

tion. I now depart from my usual custom in this respect, because the resolution which I have offered is involved in a great variety of measures that must command the attention of the Senate at this session, and it deeply concerns, as I believe, the welfare of the peace-loving, patriotic men and women of America.

Under the rules of the Senate the resolution just read must be referred to the committee which audits and controls contingent expenses, but I desire to have it known that upon the report of that committee, whether favorable or unfavorable, I will move its adoption without reference to any other committee. This course will be taken for the reason that there is no single committee of appropriate jurisdiction, and the policy involved is so vital and fundamental that the recommendation of a committee would be of little or no value.

If the resolution shall be adopted it will constitute a declaration by this body against the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war by any private interest. It will be a clear and emphatic announcement to the country, and to the world, that the Senate of the United States believes that commerce in the instrumentalities used only in warfare, whether for our own or foreign purposes, is exclusively a governmental function, a function which under no ordinary circumstances should be performed by the individual or the corporate citizen. It will initiate an American policy upon a subject which lies closer to the hearts of our people than any other now under consideration.

The inquiry which the resolution proposes is the natural sequence of the policy affirmed, and relates only to the plan, place, time, and cost of assuming the function.

Let it be at once understood that the resolution has nothing whatsoever to do with the number or character of the ships of which our Navy is, or ought to be, made up. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the adequacy or inadequacy of our Regular Army. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the controversy respecting the best method of creating and maintaining a body of military reserves. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the kind or competency of our coast fortifications. All these things are vastly important, but they are not brought under examination in the resolution which I have offered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether, if the manufacture of all sorts of munitions is taken over by the Government and exclusively confined to Government institutions, it would not go a very great way toward destroying that spirit of military activity and naval expansion which is now abroad in the land?

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe, Mr. President, that it would, and it is for the purpose of demonstrating the truth of the suggestion just made by the Senator from Colorado that I am entering upon these observations.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I believe that the Senator's conclusion stated just before my interruption might not be as accurate as outlined in the Senator's address. I am in sympathy with the belief that the acquisition by the Government of our munitions plants, or the construction of its own, and the manufacture of its munitions and equipment by itself are very desirable things, but I do believe that the proposal does affect the question of so-called military preparedness, 50 per cent of which, in my judgment, is based upon the desire of munitions plants people, who are to-day reaping enormous fortunes out of the misery and agony of Europe, to continue their manufacture for the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is right in one sense, but the statement I have made is, nevertheless, perfectly accurate, because the policy which I desire to sustain, if I can, applies with equal force to a large navy or a small navy, a large army or a small army, and it is therefore, I think, true, as I have stated, that the resolution in and of itself has nothing whatsoever to do with these things. It matters not how strong we are in military affairs or how strong we should be or how weak it is safe to be, the course suggested in the resolution is the only course that can be pursued with honor to the Nation and with due regard to the civilization we are trying to protect.

I am conscious that it will be difficult to disassociate completely the subject proposed in the resolution from the somewhat acrimonious dispute now sweeping over the country with regard to preparedness for war, and to differentiate it from the discussion concerning an embargo upon the export of arms and munitions; but I reiterate that it is wholly removed from either, and I sincerely hope that in its consideration the Senate will bear constantly in mind that it is entirely independent of both.

What I am about to say is, of course, directed to those who believe that the United States ought to have an Army and Navy, and that it may unfortunately happen that they will be called into service to preserve free institutions and protect the lives, liberties, and privileges of our people, for the resolution is meaningless to those who believe we should stand defenseless before the world.

I have not hesitated to express my views with respect to the character, extent, and strength of the military armament which the honor and safety of this country requires, and I shall express them again when the measures which involve the question are before the Senate. In the meanwhile it is sufficient to suggest that somewhere between the armed camp of William of Germany and the open dove-cote of William of Nebraska [laughter] there must be an honorable abiding place for a great nation which is prepared to lead the world toward peace, but will not submit to injustice or indignity; that somewhere between the ambition which always looks toward war, and the folly which would turn courage into cowardice, there must be a region of patriotism, wisdom, and sanity in which all good citizens can labor in harmony, not alone for our own welfare, but for the good of all humanity. Of all these things, vital as they are, I will speak at another time. The resolution I have offered assumes that we will have an Army and Navy of some kind, and that we may have war, and it propounds this question, Shall we continue to buy the armament and munitions which can be used only, first, to train, and then to kill, from private manufactories or shall the Government make them? It is a plain, direct question which, in my judgment, involves, in great measure, the peace of the world in the first instance, and then, if we must fight, the safety of the Nation. It ought to be taken for granted—and I will take it for granted—that the overwhelming proportion of the people want international peace, and believe that the paramount duty of this country is to do everything within its power to so influence the affairs of the world that disputes which have heretofore brought war may hereafter be settled righteously and peacefully in the forum of reason and justice and not in the field of brute force and inflamed passion. In modern times, at least, all right-minded men and women have hated war, but no generation has ever abhorred it as the generation now witnessing the heart-breaking soul-shocking scenes of Europe. In former days there was a chivalry and fascination about camps and battle fields which fascinated the imagination and tinted the achievements of the military profession with beautiful colors; which turned battles into a sort of romantic and honorable engagement between gentlemen of high distinction. I admit that all this was nothing more than a brilliant cloak for the baser business, but, nevertheless, it did hide some of the degradation inseparable from war. The gaudy cloak, whatever may have been its value, has now been thrown contemptuously aside and the belligerents of Europe have returned to the primitive age of undisguised brutality and ferocity; to the age of the poisoned steel; to the age which knew no difference between the combatant and the noncombatant; to the age when the rights of neutral powers were unnoticed and unknown.

War is now openly what it always has been, though disguised by stilted ceremonies—the killing of the enemy, armed or unarmed, in any possible way, just as quickly as it can be done. It matters not whether they are shot, drowned, buried alive, or starved, the object is to kill them; if not all, then so many of them that the remainder will surrender.

Science has contributed its cruel knowledge to the slaughter, and it may well be that those who are now living may see a murderous discovery that will enable a death engineer to extinguish the life of a whole community or country in the twinkling of an eye.

I see no difference in ethics between an airship dropping explosives upon the inhabitants of an unarmed city or town and poisoning the water which they must drink or the bread which they must eat.

I am not inflicting this ghastly description upon you for the purpose of criticizing the modern methods of warfare, as such, for they are strictly logical and inevitable. When one nation makes war upon another its object is to kill or maim or starve just as many as it can, and as speedily as it can, until there is submission to the demand, whatever it may be. Do not understand me to imply that a nation unjustly attacked is not to fight. It must fight or lose its place in the world and the manhood of its citizens, but that eternal fact does not modify the awful horrors of war; it simply emphasizes the everlasting truth that the nation responsible for unjust and unnecessary war will, in the final judgment day, be adjudged guilty of deliberate murder.

In view of the frightful consequences of war, the burdens, sorrows, and desolation which always attend it, it must be true

that the relation which one nation bears to another, the controversies which necessarily spring up between them, their attitude toward each other, should be considered and determined in the purest light that can be shed upon human motive and human action. It must be true that all the mainsprings of movement in such crises should be patriotic and unselfish. It must be true that those who are guiding public affairs should be free from any influence, conscious or unconscious, that would tend to warp the judgment or obscure the vision.

The love of money, the passion for profit, are planted deeply in the human heart, and when properly directed they are the fruitful sources and potent factors in the growth, development, and success of any people.

These observations bring me to the application of the resolution to the policy of the United States. Our people will in the future, even more than in the past, be in constant contact with all the powers of the earth. Unquestionably there will be controversies of all degrees of importance. Some will be vital, some will be trivial; but they must be settled either by conference, mediation, arbitration, or war. In the management of these ever-recurring difficulties our Government will need not only the highest statesmanship but, behind it and impelling it, a public opinion untainted and uncorrupted by the selfish influences, seen or unseen, of the business profit which will come from war. The men who die and the women who mourn in war have the God-given right to a public sentiment, untouched and unmodified by those whose coffers are filled with the bloody gold of traffic in war.

I agree that war may come, but if it comes it must be the result of the calm, dispassionate, loyal purpose to meet the awful scourge, because there is no other way of defending our civilization, our institutions, and our honor.

I do not assert that every person or corporation which may profit from war would incite war, but I do assert that all such persons and associations are not competent to judge the controversies which may lead to conflict, and inasmuch as they can not be removed from the great panel of the Republic, they ought to be removed from the business out of which the interest grows. It ought to be made impossible, so far as the power of the Government can be exerted, for any man or corporation to make money out of war. It ought to be true that when we invoke trial by battle no man shall be the gainer, except as he may share with all his fellow countrymen in the ultimate advantages of victory.

We need just now above all other things a rebaptism in Americanism. To me Americanism means fidelity to American interests, loyalty to American institutions, pride in our past, and confidence in our future. It means an understanding of our place in the affairs of the world, and of the rights and privileges of our citizens. It means sympathy in the struggle for liberty and justice wherever it is taking place. It means a comprehension of wrongs at home as well as wrongs abroad. It means a spirit that commands men to live for their country, and, if necessary, to die for it; but I, for one, am not willing that Americanism shall be defined and standardized by millionaire-munition makers or by the brokers, bankers, or backers who share their blood-stained profits.

I have not even intimated that any great portion of the men who are interested in manufacturing arms and munitions of war would consciously or maliciously precipitate a war, but in the very nature of things they can not look upon war with the feeling that animates the great body of the people. Men engaged in business necessarily desire that it shall be a successful business, and the business to which I have referred can not be in the highest degree successful unless the country is at war or is preparing for war.

Moreover, the evil influence is not confined to the comparatively few men who are directly engaged in such manufacture. It extends to all their commercial associates. It ramifies throughout the whole structure of industrial and financial society, and finally binds so many men together that its effect can hardly be overestimated.

I come now to the question suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

The present situation illustrates my thought in a startling way. We are considering the problem of preparedness. It is a grave, serious problem and demands the dispassionate and patriotic judgment of the people of the Nation. We ought to determine the subject in the most unselfish, farsighted, courageous spirit. In this critical moment what is the attitude of the makers of arms and munitions? Without exception, so far as I know, they are insisting upon the most comprehensive program which it is possible to conceive, and they are employing, through all the channels and all the instrumentalities which mold public thought, all the forces at their command for a completeness

of preparation that would turn this country into a military camp, and practically destroy all ambition, save the ambition to overcome by force of arms the entire world. This is a perfectly natural course for them to pursue, and I would be astonished if they were to pursue any other. Their business is to supply material for war, and it is not in mortal man to escape the temptations of gain in the enterprises in which they are engaged.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. COLT. I wish to ask the Senator a question. If the Government enters into the arms business, whether it would not follow that the Government itself could not export any arms in time of war to any belligerent nation, because that would be an unneutral act? And if all nations adopted this policy of the manufacture of their arms, whether it would not necessarily follow that each nation must rely upon itself to supply its own arms in time of war, because all other nations would be forbidden from exporting arms?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I shall come presently to the consideration of that aspect of the subject; but lest I might overlook it, I desire to say now that in my opinion the people of the United States ought not to supply any other nation or any other people with arms unless the Government itself is willing to assume the obligation of war and participate in the conflict, whatever it may be. I do not say that there are not circumstances under which it would become the highest moral obligation for the Government of the United States to aid a people struggling against injustice and oppression.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Since the Senator has been interrupted, I desire to ask him if he does not consider it true that a belligerent nation may be as much aided by furnishing it with food supplies, for example, as with arms and ammunition; and, if that be true, if it is any more reprehensible to supply arms or ammunition or anything pertaining to that subject than it is to supply such a nation with food?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I answer the question very willingly. It is true that there are times and circumstances under which food is as necessary to a belligerent as are munitions of war or arms; but it is not true that the same policy which would require the Government to manufacture implements or instrumentalities that are usable only in war should be applied to the production of grain and cattle and foodstuffs and clothing, products which are used not alone in war but in peace as well.

To emphasize the effect of the private manufacture of arms and munitions, I beg the attention of the Senate to some things that have happened in the markets of the country since the beginning of the war in Europe. I have before me some information furnished by the Legislative Reference Division in the Library of Congress indicating the growth and profit of the business.

After the commencement of the war and prior to October 26, 1915, there were organized in the United States 174 new corporations for the purpose of manufacturing munitions of war. I am not now referring to those corporations in which the capitalization has been increased. I am referring to the extraordinary fact that 174 new corporations, some of them immensely large, some of them of lesser magnitude, have been organized in our country for no other purpose than to furnish munitions of war to Europe.

It would consume time unnecessarily, even if I had the statistics, to describe the capitalization of these corporations or the war contracts which they have undertaken. It will serve my purpose to lay before you the fact that in 15 months—that is to say, from August 1, 1914, to November 1, 1915, a period of 15 months—there were exported from this country to Europe ammunition and firearms to the value of \$161,964,276, and the exports are increasing month by month.

I submit the estimated amount of war contracts with a limited number of the large corporations:

American Car & Foundry	\$35,000,000
American Locomotive	66,000,000
American Steel Foundries	15,000,000
Baldwin Locomotive Works	100,000,000

Bethlehem Steel Co., 11,000 shells per day, together with field guns and other like arms.

Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., 35,000 tons of steel rounds.

Crucible Steel of America	\$10,500,000
General Electric	68,000,000
New York Air Brake	20,242,000
Westinghouse Air Brake	20,000,000
Westinghouse Manufacturing Co.	100,000,000

This does not include the contracts of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. of shrapnel shells, or the Du Pont Powder Co. of explosives, or the Electric Storage Battery Co., or the General Chemical Co., or of the General Motors Co., or of the Lackawanna Steel Co., or of the Tennessee Copper Co., all of which are immense concerns and have been largely engaged in the same general business.

The most striking illustration, probably, of the effect upon these large corporations of the manufacture of arms and munitions is found in the unparalleled increase in the market value of their stocks. I instance some of them: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., the value of the stock increased from 10 to 43½; of another class of stock, from 43 to 74½.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I hope it will not interrupt the Senator for me to make the suggestion that all the securities which I presume he is going to read were at abnormal prices at the beginning of the war on account of the depressed condition of business which existed at that time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think, Mr. President, that the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts is at least measurably true. I do not assert, as I shall presently explain, that the entire increase in the value of the capitalization is due to war contracts; but the comparison is so striking that I could not forbear putting it before the Senate.

American Car & Foundry, from 50½ to 86½, common.

American Locomotive, from 28 to 71.

American Steel Foundries, from 29½ to 70½.

Baldwin Locomotive Works, from 43 to 112½.

Bethlehem Steel Co., from 41½ to 583, common; 82½ to 166, preferred.

Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., from 25½ to 59.

Crucible Steel of America, from 16½ to 92.

Du Pont Powder Co., from 58½ to 104.

Electric Storage Battery Co., from 51 to 71½.

General Electric Co., from 146½ to 177.

General Chemical Co., from 168 to 348.

General Motors Co., from 90 to 364.

Lackawanna Steel Co., from 32 to 85½.

New York Air Brake, from 66 to 148.

Pennsylvania Steel Co., from 62½ to 96.

Tennessee Copper, from 38½ to 63½.

Westinghouse Air Brake, from 129½ to 143½.

Without reckoning the effect upon any of the thousands of other corporations which have engaged in the business, the added value of the stocks of the corporations which I have quoted amounts in the aggregate to the appalling sum of \$432,056,500.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I will yield in just a moment. I ought to say in this connection that I may be in error with respect to this aggregate. It may be that the statement furnished me by the authorities is not computed upon the basis stated in it. I have computed this sum upon the assumption that in the statement furnished all the capitalization has been reduced to the basis of \$100 per share. There are some of these corporations in which the par value of the share is less than \$100, and if the person who made the computation did not take that into account the sum that I have last stated ought to be reduced about \$50,000,000. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I interrupt the Senator merely to add to his statement that which I saw upon the same subject some two months ago in the columns of the World Work Magazine. In the article to which I refer it was stated that the increase in the stock value of the institutions engaged in furnishing supplies to the allies was greater than the total sum of their contracts, and my recollection is that the latter was then given at \$750,000,000. Upon that assumption the increase at that time must have been over three quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, just a moment. I do not know about that; I can neither affirm it nor deny it; but I do know—at least it was related to me by one who was interested in the organization—of a company being organized with a capital of \$200,000 receiving a contract for arms and munitions at a price that would enable the company in the execution of that single contract to return the entire capitalization of the company, assuming that it was but a temporary affair, and not only

so, but to award a profit in the undertaking of more than \$200,000.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator if he has had any inquiry made or has made any investigation of the probable increase which those who have produced food products or those who have had horses and mules and other animals for sale, have made on account of or as a result of the war.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have not made any such inquiry because the inquiry is not pertinent to the subject I am discussing. I assume that the Government of the United States is not about to enter upon the production of all things that are used by the people of the world both in war and peace. I am limiting my proposition to those things that are used only in war, and the whole basis of it is that the influence of profit ought to be eliminated, in so far as it can be, from the minds of the people when they come to determine whether they will have war or peace.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, one more question. Would it be the purpose of the Senator, in case we are engaged in war, to prevent the manufacture of arms and ammunition to be sold to our Government at a greater price than cost?

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all. I hope that all the countries of the world will adopt this policy. A good many of them have; that is, they have made great strides in that direction. But if there is to be an interchange in arms it ought to be a governmental interchange and not a private interchange. That is my view of the subject.

Mr. WEEKS. But the Senator from Colorado suggested that that could not be done without a violation of neutrality; at least I do not see any way in which it could be done. What I am trying to get at is this: How would we, in time of stress, obtain our supplies unless we allowed some one to make a profit out of the arms and ammunition which were going to be manufactured? Certainly it is not the purpose of the Senator that the Government shall have a plant sufficient to supply our needs in time of war.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is, Mr. President, my purpose.

Mr. WEEKS. I have not the figures before me, but it would require a plant that would cover the whole District of Columbia and probably the employment of 200,000 men.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator is very greatly in error about that, but if the assumption of this function by the Government will tend to prevent war and secure the adjustment of international controversies through peaceful methods, this Government can well afford to own and maintain a plant that will be idle a part of the time. Of course, if we are so unfortunate as to get into war and the Government plant or plants are insufficient to furnish the war material, we can convert private institutions that are now engaged in making commodities for peaceful industry into war factories. We have done it, or it has been done by private owners already.

Mr. President, there is an automobile factory not very far from my own home. It has ceased to manufacture automobiles and is now turning out day after day great quantities of casings for shrapnel shells, and I was told that the expense of converting the factory from one intended to manufacture motor cars to one turning out shrapnel shells was negligible. There are a thousand ways in which the Government can supplement the inadequacy of its plants if we shall unfortunately engage in war.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I will venture to suggest that the Government of the United States could, with perfect facility, from one set of good models, furnish the country with the jigs which would be necessary to turn out any of these munitions, and when the occasion arose furnish these jigs without delay, without additional expense, and put these plants to work throughout the country with ease.

Mr. CUMMINS. Practically there is no difficulty at all in that phase of the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. May I not suggest to the Senator that that difficulty, whatever it might be, is a difficulty which exists at the present time and always has existed when private parties made these munitions, and it could not be increased or made more difficult by the Government doing it.

Mr. CUMMINS. A very appropriate answer is that our facilities in the manufacture of arms and munitions, I suppose, have multiplied ten times since the war in Europe began.

Possibly I am understating the comparison rather than overstating it.

The magnitude of the business may be further shown by reference to the disbursements of the United States for the preparation that we have already made. During the 10 years beginning with 1906 and ending in 1915 we have expended in ordnance, engineering, and naval construction \$650,028,630, and for all military purposes \$2,414,291,255. I have not been able to ascertain just how much of these amounts has been paid to private manufacturers, nor is the exact proportion necessary to emphasize the thought I am endeavoring to impress upon you. It is well known that a large part of it has gone to those whose business it has been to furnish the United States with armament and munitions.

May I read in this connection very briefly from a letter I have just received, bearing date this morning, from the Navy Department? I do it simply to indicate how great the business is:

January 19, 1916—

This is inclosed in a letter to me from the Secretary of the Navy—

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
January 19, 1916.

Amount paid to manufacturers for arms, armament, munitions, and raw material for same, 1911-1915, inclusive (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for)	\$46,721,170.56
Amount expended for manufacture of arms, armament, and munitions by the Government, 1911-1915, inclusive (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for; a portion of the material charge is a duplication of amounts shown as paid to manufacturers, as the raw material purchased was subsequently used in manufacture):	
Labor	\$9,011,679.09
Indirect	1,705,695.08
Material	47,084,722.23
Amount paid by Government for stores other than ordnance material, 1911-1915 (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for)	58,084,722.23
Amount expended at navy yards for manufacture of ships' equipment and supplies, 1906-1915, inclusive (impracticable to furnish from 1906, as prior to 1911 ordnance materials were not separately accounted for; a portion of the material charge is a duplication of amounts shown as paid to manufacturers, as the raw material purchased was subsequently used in manufacture):	83,066,011.52
Labor	\$9,525,352.34
Indirect	2,215,460.56
Material	24,529,950.72
Amount paid by Government to private contractors for construction of vessels, 1906-1915	36,270,763.62
Amount expended at navy yards for construction of vessels, 1906-1915	203,996,336.65
Amount expended at navy yards for construction of vessels, 1906-1915	37,548,045.33
COMPARATIVE COST OF SISTER SHIPS, CONTRACT AND GOVERNMENT BUILT (HULL, MACHINERY, AND ARMOR).	
Contract.	Government.
Louisiana	\$6,065,531.19
Utah	7,002,295.02
Texas	9,476,937.31
Connecticut	\$6,394,757.77
Florida	8,983,755.46
New York	9,757,749.07
22,544,763.52	25,136,262.30

I dare not consume the time to fully describe the present situation with respect to the manufacture of arms and munitions. It would not be far from the truth if I were to say that every machine shop in the country that has a lathe in it and that is willing to accept an order from one of the belligerents is engaged in turning out shells of some description. Big foundries and little foundries are casting for war; gunmakers are working day and night, and all these in the less-important industries scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

May I lay before you a rather interesting article that I saw in the New York Times of last Sunday? It is headed "Our greatest arms plant," and reads:

Remington-Union cartridge factory at Bridgeport an Aladdin's castle; industrial army of 50,000 organized by one man.

I will read a paragraph from the body of the article:

Twelve million dollars spent in less than a year have brought into being what will probably be the greatest small-arms and ammunition plant in the world—that of the Remington Arms and Union Metallic Cartridge factories at Bridgeport, Conn. When it is in full operation it will call for the services of from 34,000 to 36,000 employees, bringing the total of the industrial army employed in various places by these companies to 50,000. The Bridgeport plant covers hundreds of acres and is the latest word in factory construction, and yet in its present form it may be said to have actually sprung into existence, to have come before the eyes of Bridgeport, in a moment.

The enormous plant of the Remington Arms Co. was not in existence last March. It was turned over to the company by the contractors in November; so that this immense creation was completed in less than eight months, and even as far back as last August it was so far completed that outwardly it looked as it does to-day.

It has made such a revolution in Bridgeport that the company has been obliged to build practically another city within the city for the accommodation of the thousands of men who are coming from all parts of New England to form a new colony; it has gone into the work of sewerage and grading, and is now about to turn its attention to the question of schooling for the children of its subcity. Eighteen thousand men and women in the employ of the Remington Arms, 16,000 more in that of the Union Metallic Cartridge Co., will form the subcity, and with them will come their families. The company is now taking them on at the rate, in the Remington plant alone, of 2,000 a month.

Concerning the same enterprise, I saw an article in one of the New York papers, possibly the New York Tribune, relating to the capitalization of the organization. It is a consolidation, Mr. President, and this is the way it is described in the paper to which I refer:

\$60,000,000 MUNITION COMPANY CHARTERED—REMINGTON AND UNION METALLIC COMBINATION AT BRIDGEPORT FORMED.

HARTFORD, January 15.

Connecticut's biggest war baby—

What irony there is in that description! The article continues—

a \$60,000,000 corporation for the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions, was launched to-day when papers incorporating the Remington Arms-Union Metallic Cartridge Corporation, of Bridgeport, were filed in the office of the State secretary.

The purpose of the new corporation is to acquire the stock and to take over and carry on the business of the Remington Arms & Ammunition Co. of Bridgeport, incorporated under the laws of New York, and the Union Metallic Cartridge Co., also of Bridgeport, and incorporated under the laws of Connecticut. It is further stated in the papers that the purposes are to make, manufacture, purchase, and sell firearms, projectiles, and ammunition, and to build and construct plants for the manufacture of such articles.

And the article proceeds with a graphic description of the efficiency which this corporation is shortly to reach.

I also read a very few words from a most interesting article published in the Chicago Tribune of Monday last, I believe, written by Mr. Gus C. Roeder, a correspondent now in Germany—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from Iowa whether he has anywhere been able to ascertain the amount of capital actually invested in the Remington-Union Metallic enterprise?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not. I have not looked into that phase of it at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt the Senator will agree with me that it is very much less than the capitalization of \$60,000,000, as announced.

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably. Nearly all these corporations are overcapitalized, I think. I am reading from a description by this very graphic writer of Berlin. He says:

WAR MAKES MANY RICH.

Because money is so plentiful, prices have gone up considerably. This applies to nearly every article. Men in the field and officers are receiving war salary, which is double the amount paid to the military in time of peace. Besides, the firms which formerly employed the men now serving the colors are paying half salary to their former employees. This continues until the end of the war. This money is usually paid direct to the families at home.

Then, again, so many people have suddenly become immensely rich since the beginning of the war. This applies mostly to those who are employed in furnishing material used in connection with the war. There are so many get-rich-quick families that some Germans are wishing that the war may continue for many more years to come—

And so on in like fashion throughout a half column.

It may be that circumstances will arise which can be met only by war; when honor, safety, liberty, and conscience will all demand armed resistance. I am hoping that these conditions will not confront us, but if there comes a time at which we must decide for war or against war, the men and boys who must die in the struggle which we may enter, the homes that will be made desolate, and the sorrow which will fill the land have a right to insist that the question touching our honor, safety, and institutions shall be decided in a forum uncorrupted and undisturbed by love of money or the opportunity which business may see of reaping profit from the slaughter of the human kind.

Mr. President, if it is good policy to permit the private manufacture of arms and munitions of war, why is it not good policy to allow men to recruit armies and to sell them to the Government which is to employ armies? It has not been long since that was the practice of many governments. It has been but little more than a hundred years since it was regarded as entirely consistent with the highest morality and the most exalted ethics for a government to farm out the enlistment and the training of its armies. The civilized sense of mankind overturned so brutal and so dangerous a policy, and it will not be long until that same sense which takes into account the dearest possessions of civilized man, will drive out this source of profit from the great court which finally determines whether we shall be at peace or whether we shall be at war.

If the reasons I have given for the Government manufacture of all such things were the only reasons pertinent to the inquiry, I would confidently submit them, not only as conclusive, but as overwhelming. There are, however, other considerations which lead to the same result. In the event of war there must be a source for the supply of arms and munitions constant and dependable. So long as private corporations are the source the manufactories will be established at those places most convenient to the manufacturers and most profitable in operation, and the Government must depend upon their production or go unsupplied. There are some very worthy people who sincerely believe that we are in grave danger of invasion, and the officers of the Army are practically a unit now in the conclusion that if one of the great powers of Europe were to make war upon us the entire territory east of the Allegheny Mountains would speedily, if not at once, fall into the hands of the enemy. If you will draw a line parallel to our eastern sea coast and 100 miles inland, substantially every plant capable of producing arms and munitions in any considerable quantities will be found between that line and the Atlantic seaboard; and, as I remember it, every factory permanently engaged in such work, save one, is east of the Allegheny Mountains. If, therefore, the fears of those students of international affairs who anticipate the capture and subjection of the eastern part of our country are well founded, the United States is criminally negligent in permitting the continuance of a condition which, when that unhappy day shall come, leaves it helpless and hopeless.

It must be perfectly obvious to every thoughtful man who believes that we should prepare for war that the manufactories which are to produce the implements of war should be distributed throughout the country between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains. It must be equally obvious that private enterprise will never locate them in that part of the country, and that if we are to pursue the path of safety nothing remains but the assumption of such work by the Government itself, and the establishment of the governmental factories in those localities least accessible to an invading force.

The subject in most of its phases has been under discussion for a long time. It has never received serious attention, simply because there has been a sense of security against foreign armies and navies that made such protection unnecessary. It is not so now, for whether we are in danger or not the people have been compelled to think about war and to carefully study the American situation. It can not be doubted that, divergent as we are upon the extent of preparation reasonable or necessary, there is little difference of opinion respecting the subject I am discussing.

There is another aspect of the matter worthy of a moment's reference: The neutrality of the United States in the European war is gravely questioned, and the country is full of bitter animosities on account of the export of arms and munitions to some of the belligerent powers, while others are, by the condition of the war, denied access to our markets. This is not the time to discuss the proper relation of the United States toward Europe. It is sufficient to say that we have proclaimed neutrality. How faithfully we have observed the obligations of neutrality is open to dispute; but, assuming that as an organized Government we have been neutral, it is the only respect in which we have been neutral. Individually we are on one side or the other. Industrially, commercially, and financially we are not neutral. The consequence is that we are torn with dissensions and constantly confronted with the most perplexing questions we have ever met.

I now come to a more direct answer to the inquiry propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

If the manufacture of arms and munitions had been at the beginning of the war a governmental function alone, then we would have been compelled to have decided promptly and effectively whether the United States, as a Government, would furnish any or all of the belligerents with arms and munitions, and the decision of that question would either have made us participants in the war or insured a neutrality not open to controversy.

It is not for me at this time to discuss the great, broad inquiry as to our policy toward Europe; it is not for me to ask whether, in obedience to the commands of civilization, we ought to have protested by force of arms against the invasion of Belgium. I express no opinion upon the subject; but I say that if it was our duty and if the Government had been the sole manufacturer of arms and munitions, then, if we continued to supply the allies with arms we would have declared for the allies, and if it was, in the opinion of the people the wiser, the better, the more Christian course to remain neutral, then neither of the belligerents would have received arms and

munitions from the borders of the United States. For one, I believe that the course of the United States should be open; I believe it should be bold and courageous; it should be either for a belligerent or neutral as between the belligerents, and I have never been persuaded that the divorce between the Government as an organization and the action and conduct of its citizens can be very successfully observed or established.

The objection to the system proposed in the resolution, so far as I have heard, is one of cost entirely. It is said that if the Government undertakes to manufacture all the arms and munitions for the equipment and use of the Army and Navy the expense will be greater, first, because as a general rule the cost of Government manufacture is larger than the cost of private manufacture; second, because to meet the emergencies of war the Government would be compelled to construct and maintain plants with a capacity greatly in excess of the ordinary requirements.

My reply is twofold. If I have fairly perceived and correctly expressed the evil influence of private profit in such things, the matter of cost in manufacture shrinks into insignificance; second, while I am ready to admit that ordinarily a private corporation can produce an article at lower cost than a Government establishment, it never has been true, and it is not true now, that the private corporation will sell to the Government the article at a lower price than the cost to the Government in making it.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to call the attention of the Senator and the Senate to the fact that the Government of the United States is now making its own powder at about 25 cents a pound, while these foreign Governments are paying for it three or four times as much.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have with me here a great mass of proof with respect to the question I have just stated; that is, with respect to the comparative cost to the Government of making war material and the price paid for similar material to private manufacturers. I do not intend to consume the time of the Senate by reading it. It is the history of the last 10 years. If there is any one thing conclusively shown in the records of Congress and of the department, it is that, with here and there an exception, the Government has always made for itself these instrumentalities at a cost far below the price it has been compelled to pay when it has purchased them.

It will not, of course, be understood that my resolution contemplates an instantaneous change in our policy. With every effort strained in that direction it will require years to accomplish it, but it will never be accomplished unless we begin the movement. Nor must it be forgotten that if, after having provided ourselves with all reasonable facilities for manufacturing war material, we become engaged in war and our plants are insufficient, we can either contract with private concerns, which, with little change in their machinery, can make most of the articles necessary in warfare, or we can do as they have done abroad—take possession of them and operate them for the time being.

I bring the discussion to a close. I recognize that the policy I advocate is a revolution in our system, but that it is sound and will promote peace, safety, and honor, I have no doubt whatsoever. We have so long indulged the hope that all our international controversies could be adjusted without the intervention of arms that we have not examined carefully the causes of war. Now, that we are witnessing the most terrifying and devastating conflict of all time; now, that we can comprehend the irretrievable disaster which war inflicts; now, that we are urged to put ourselves in readiness to successfully engage in such a struggle, it becomes our bounden duty to do all that is within human power to expel from our national life everything that will interfere with the highest, purest mortal judgment, and remove every temptation that will lead us into war. If war must come, let it come when honorable peace is impossible and at the command of influences springing from love of liberty, love of country, love of humanity, and not from passion inflamed by the sordid hope of gain.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60, being Order of Business No. 33. It is the joint resolution providing for an investigation of the subject of transportation by a joint committee of the Senate and House. It has been unanimously reported by the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, before the request is acted upon, may I be permitted to secure some information? I should like to ask, conceding that I have not been able to be before the In-

terstate Commerce Committee, when this joint resolution received the consideration of the committee?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It received the consideration of the committee at the meeting held before the last one. I will say to the Senator that it was fully considered at that time and unanimously approved, the question of certain phraseology being left to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and myself. We agreed upon that phraseology, and we have reported the joint resolution to the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask the Senator what expense it is estimated this commission will entail upon the Government?

Mr. NEWLANDS. We have put the expense at \$25,000. I assume that that amount will cover it. The committee will inquire into the whole subject of transportation, just as the National Monetary Commission inquired into the question of banking and currency and our financial conditions. The resolution follows the recommendation of the President of the United States in his last message.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to say, expressing my own personal view, that I am not disposed to the increase and multiplication of these different forms of commissions, which invariably have resulted in accomplishing nothing more than earning their own commissions. But in this case—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The joint resolution does not provide for a commission but simply provides for a joint committee of the Senate and House, composed of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. The information is satisfactory, Mr. President, removing one of the objections I have; and since the Interstate Commerce Committee has, as the Senator says, unanimously recommended it—I take it upon proper information—I shall not urge any objection at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was not able to hear what the Senator from Nevada said.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60, being Order of Business No. 33. It is a joint resolution providing for a general investigation of the subject of transportation by a joint committee of Members of the Senate and House, with a view to reporting as soon as practicable; but the report probably will not be submitted until the next session of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator what is the necessity of this commission? Has the committee determined that there is a necessity for it?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is not a commission. This is a joint committee of the Senate and House, composed of members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is so near 2 o'clock that I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the request for unanimous consent.

SAN ANTONIO BICENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate joint resolution No. 72, referring to the San Antonio Bicentennial Exposition. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], when it was called up a day or two ago, desired to look further into the matter, and it was laid over for that purpose. I trust the Senator is satisfied as a result of his examination.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the information I have compels me to oppose the resolution; and at this time I shall object to its consideration, because I have not the time between now and 2 o'clock to tell the Senate the reason why I object.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order—the consideration of the calendar.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the consideration of bills on the calendar under Rule VIII. The Secretary will state the first bill.

The first bill on the calendar was the bill (S. 2520) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State University of the State of Nevada.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution No. 60.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33—Senate joint resolution No. 60. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GALLINGER. That would displace the unfinished business.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, is that motion debatable at this time?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I did not hear what the Senator from Michigan said.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wanted to say a word to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to the effect that it occurs to me that it is not wise to take up this matter and dispose of it in 10 minutes. With the general purposes of the resolution I am in accord. I was present during the very few minutes that the committee considered this great question. I know that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has expressed his desire to offer an amendment to the resolution. Anyway, it seems to me, Mr. President—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Upon the statement of my colleague on the Interstate Commerce Committee—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that prior to 2 o'clock a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill is not subject to debate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Upon the statement of my colleague on the Interstate Commerce Committee that he would like this matter to go over, of course I yield to the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn, then.

RENÉ W. PINTÓ Y WENTWORTH.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have two joint resolutions which I wish to report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. One of them authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis a certain young gentleman whose name is given, a citizen of Cuba, to be educated at that school at the expense of the Cuban Government. The other is a like joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive another gentleman into the academy at West Point, to be educated at the expense of the Cuban Government. I shall be glad if the joint resolutions could be considered at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Are the joint resolutions unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. STONE. The joint resolutions are unanimously reported; and if they could be considered at this time, I should like to have it done. I therefore report back favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba, and I submit a report (No. 54) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

It authorizes the Secretary of War to permit René W. Pintó y Wentworth, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, provided that no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that he shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the course in the various departments of instruction, and that he shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States, and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or conduct and so recommended by the academic board; and also that in the case of René W. Pintó y Wentworth the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARLOS HEVIA Y REYES GAVILÁN.

Mr. STONE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive

for instruction at the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, and I submit a report (No. 55) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

It authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to permit Mr. Carlos Hevia y Reyes Gavilán, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, provided that no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that he shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the course in the various departments of instruction, and that he shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States, and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or conduct and so recommended by the academic board.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next bill on the calendar.

The next bill on the calendar was the bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

Mr. STERLING. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION OF LAND-OFFICE NOTICES.

The bill (S. 1062) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. After the word "him," in line 5, on page 1, the Senator from New Mexico proposes to insert a comma and the words "or, in case of a public-land entry, by the entryman."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from New Mexico desires to speak upon that amendment. He is out of the Chamber. For that reason I ask that it go over. I am perfectly willing to vote upon it, personally.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from New Mexico has already discussed the matter quite extensively.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. FALL] is unavoidably absent, on account of sickness, and will not be here to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] now desires to present a very radical and a very far-reaching and important amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hughes	Myers	Smoot
Beckham	Husting	Nelson	Sterling
Catron	James	Oliver	Stone
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Page	Swanson
Colt	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Curtis	Kern	Poinexter	Tillman
du Pont	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Fletcher	Lane	Ransdell	Vardaman
Gallinger	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Warren
Gore	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Weeks
Gronna	Lewis	Sheppard	Williams
Hardwick	Lippitt	Sherman	Works
Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	
Hollis	Martine	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I beg to state that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is detained at home on account of illness.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has been called to his home and is unable to attend the session of the Senate to-day.

Mr. STERLING. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota]. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] on important business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] is unavoidably absent from the Senate and will not be able to attend the session to-day.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] has been detained from the Senate yesterday and to-day on account of sickness in his family. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who has been called to New York. He has a pair recorded.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent. He is engaged on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. STONE. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained from the Senate by illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 30, page 29, being the section to which I called the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] yesterday. I have written the proposed amendment somewhat hurriedly, and as I fear the Clerk may not be able to read it I will read it myself.

On page 29, line 20, before the word "treaty," insert the word "or"; strike out all of line 21 and in lieu thereof insert:

Of the United States is involved or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority.

So that the section as amended will read:

SEC. 30. That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute or treaty of the United States is involved or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority, and such final judgments or decrees may and can be reviewed, revised, reversed, modified, or affirmed by said Supreme Court of the United States on appeal or writ of error by the party aggrieved within the same time, in the same manner, under the same regulations, and by the same procedure, as far as applicable, as the final judgments and decrees of the district courts of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would the Senator from Utah object to having his amendment printed and lie over until to-morrow?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is rather complicated, and the section as it appears in the bill is the existing law. If the Senator will have it printed and lie over until to-morrow, possibly we can agree upon the acceptance of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection to that course being taken, but I should like to say just a word in reference to it, so that what I say may be considered in connection with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie over. The Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the provision embraced in section 30, and which is now included in the organic act, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, provides that jurisdiction of the Supreme Court shall extend to cases in which the Constitution or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved. I think the latter part of that provision was inserted under some sort of a misapprehension. Certainly it could not have been intended to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States to a case where the title, right, or privilege was only that of the United States, but what was evidently intended to be covered was a case where the title or right or privilege was that of some person or corporation claimed under the United States or under the

Constitution or a statute or a treaty of the United States. That language has been in the statutes of the United States, with reference to appeals from the State courts, for a great many years, and it is perfectly understood and has received judicial construction over and over again. The language which now appears in the Philippine bill, so far as I know, never has occurred anywhere else, and, as it seems to me, it is wholly inapplicable to what we want to accomplish.

Therefore the amendment which I have offered, in so far as it relates to the question of title, right, or privilege, has adopted the language which is now found in the statute with reference to appeals from the State courts; and I have also inserted the word "immunity," which seems by inadvertence to have been omitted from the organic act.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Georgia permit the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to be offered?

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought that had been done.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I supposed the amendment had been offered, otherwise I would have presented it. I offer it now formally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following additional section:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute within two years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter prescribed. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately after the passage of this Act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is of far-reaching importance. Indeed, the bill proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, while important in a way and admirable in a way, is of very little significance when compared with the proposition advanced by the Senator from Arkansas. The bill proposes some changes which seem to make for a more liberal participation on the part of the Filipinos in their own government. On the other hand, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas proposes that in a definite time, within a reasonable time I think, a step shall be taken that this Government, in my judgment, ought to take, and to the necessity and propriety of our taking that step, either in the manner proposed by the Senator from Arkansas or in some similar manner, I now wish to especially invite the attention of my Democratic colleagues.

If it be not old fashioned to call attention to Democratic pledges on this floor, and if it be not unusual to expect Democratic compliance with those pledges, then the proposition advanced by the Senator from Arkansas is not without force as a party proposition, for it seems to me that if there is any one thing upon which the Democratic Party has been absolutely consistent, uniformly so, since the acquisition of the Philippines, it has been in regard to our position with reference to the acquisition and retention of those islands.

I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to several platform utterances on that question. First, in 1900, at the first

national convention we had after the acquisition of those islands, we used this language:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the Republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not be citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not be subjects without imperiling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization nor to convert the Republic into an empire we favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay; but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts. The war of criminal aggression against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty, the price is always too high.

Again, in 1904, the Democratic Party in national convention, used this language:

FILIPINOS AND CUBANS.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

The endeavor of the Secretary of War, by pledging the Government's indorsement for "promoters" in the Philippine Islands, to make the United States a partner in speculative legislation of the archipelago, which was only temporarily held up by the opposition of the Democratic Senators in the last session, will, if successful, lead to entanglements from which it will be difficult to escape.

Again, in 1908 our party used this language:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

In the platform of 1912, on which the last campaign was fought, we find this pledge:

THE PHILIPPINES.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines or elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

Mr. President, it is evident from these declarations of our party in national convention assembled that Senators on this side of the aisle at least are pledged, so far as they can be pledged, by four successive platforms in the party to grant to the Philippine Islands independence as soon as a stable form of government can be established in those islands, and to guarantee that independence until a treaty of neutrality can be negotiated with the other nations of the earth.

There may be raised by Senators on this side the question of fact as to whether or not a stable government can be established in the Philippine Islands now, or if not now within what length of time such a government may be established. I take it, Mr. President and Senators, that the Democratic national convention, when they used the expression "a stable form of government," did not mean a form of government such as could be and would be maintained among the English-speaking and Anglo-Saxon peoples, because the probability is that the people of the Philippine Islands might not attain that standard in many, many years, not even in hundreds of years. So the expression, giving it a fair construction, must have meant as soon as those people were capable of maintaining a stable form of government according to their own standards, according to their own environment, according to their own location, and among nations in that part of the world.

If that be true, and I do not think any Senator on either side will take issue with the reasonableness of that statement, either the legislation so ably championed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska rests on a false basis and is unworthy

of support, or those people are almost if not quite at the point when they are capable of self-government according to the standards of their own people and their own kind of people.

The Senator from Nebraska, by the bill that he reports, would give to those people a large measure of self-government. If the bill that he champions shall become the law, and I want to say I favor it whether this amendment is agreed to or not, those people will be intrusted with a still larger measure of self-government than they have been allowed even since the beginning of this administration.

My only objection to the legislation is that it does not go far enough, because if those people are entitled to and are worthy of the amount of self-government the Senator proposes to give them in this legislation, then undoubtedly a stable form of government within the meaning of our Democratic platforms at least can be speedily established there.

So the Senator from Arkansas by his amendment proposes that within two years after all of the machinery which the pending legislation seeks to set up and establish can be put in operation, within two years from that time, when the people of the Philippine Islands will be practically intrusted with all the essentials of self-government, we shall say that now we will carry out the pledges of our party, carry out our duty to the Philippine people, and allow them to depart in peace and to set up their own government among the nations of the world.

I do not know, Mr. President, to what extent the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators who oppose this amendment are prepared to take issue on the question of fact as to whether or not those people are now capable or will be capable within two years of maintaining a stable form of government. We have heard eloquent Senators on this floor, members of this committee, describe in terms of general accuracy and with thorough detail the amount and the general diffusion of education that there is among those people. We have heard the fact adverted to more than once, and with increasing eloquence every time, by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that those people are maintaining a local legislative assembly in which every single member is a college graduate. Of course that might be of somewhat doubtful value, but the fact has been asserted, and I suppose it must be true.

We hear that there are 500,000 children in the schools of those islands. I venture the statement—and I do not know whether any Senator here is prepared to take issue with it or not; I doubt it—from what I have heard on this floor and from what I have read in the hearings it is doubtful whether there are many peoples in Central or South America, and certainly there are few in Asia or Africa, that have more capacity for setting up, establishing, and maintaining a stable form of government, such as is adapted to them and their needs, than have the people of the Philippine Islands. If so, no Democratic Senator who sits on this side of the Chamber and who believes in the declarations of his party, who believes that these pledges were made for some other purpose than to get into office on, who believes that campaign pledges in a platform ought to be something more than mere rhetoric, ought to hesitate to take whatever steps are necessary to give to those islands within a reasonable time that independence which we have insisted ought to be given to them ever since they were acquired by this country.

Mr. President, I am going to take up this question briefly—because I am not proposing to make an extensive argument on it—from another standpoint, a standpoint that appeals, or ought to appeal, to every Senator without regard to his party alliance, and that is from the standpoint of common sense. Does the possession of those islands profit us? Does it strengthen our position nationally or internationally? Does it pay either commercially or from any other standpoint? Senators, there is no dispute over the fact that since we have had those islands they have cost the American people many millions of dollars. It was estimated on this floor yesterday by a distinguished Senator of long and honorable service here, that the increase in military and naval expenditures in our establishment, because of our possession of these islands, had averaged \$25,000,000 a year for the 18 years during which we have held possession of them. That same Senator estimated that, leaving out the expenses of the great Filipino insurrection, the possession of those islands during that period of time had cost the United States of America not less than \$600,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. Mr. LIPPITT. I do not care to interrupt the Senator unless he is willing that I shall do so.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LIPPITT. In regard to the statement of Senators that these islands have cost us, and are costing us, \$25,000,000 a year, I am aware that that statement has been made on this floor two or three times. During the hearings before the committee Gen. McIntyre, the chief of the Insular Bureau, War Department, was asked to compile for the committee a statement of the actual cost to the United States of the Philippines over and above what it would cost the United States without them. He put a very elaborate statement into the record. That statement shows that the Philippine Islands have cost us—I think it is for the years since 1903 to and including the year 1914—\$119,000,000, or at the rate of \$9,475,000 a year.

If the Senator from Georgia will take that statement and examine the figures for the year 1914, instead of taking the average of the whole number of years as the annual expense, he will find that those islands are now costing the United States \$7,692,000 annually; or, in other words, the cost to the United States of the Philippine Islands is practically to-day \$7,700,000 annually.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator from Rhode Island himself really believe that those figures are accurate?

Mr. LIPPITT. I do. I have no reason to doubt them.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator is doubtless familiar with an earlier report that this same gentleman, Gen. McIntyre, rendered to President Taft, in which he stated that it was absolutely impossible to estimate such expenditures by the year.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, that may have been so. I am not familiar with the report to which the Senator refers.

Mr. HARDWICK. That it was a matter of speculation and guesswork to such a large extent, and that he could not estimate these expenditures.

Mr. LIPPITT. May I ask where the Senator from Georgia gets his figures of \$25,000,000 as the annual cost of the Philippines? The only figures which we have, of which I know, from any authoritative source are these figures. They were put in as the result of a very careful compilation, I presume, though it may be in some cases they are estimates.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator from Rhode Island will pardon me just a moment, I will say that I was quoting from the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who yesterday made a statement in reference to this matter on the floor. Of course, the Senator knew when he made it, and understood at the time, that it was a mere statement of his opinion after considerable investigation of the subject; and while, of course, Gen. McIntyre also has a right to his opinion, it is well known how these officers of the Insular Bureau feel toward the retention of the Philippines. It is well known that in their reports they have insisted under other administrations that it was practically impossible to estimate how much of the Army and Navy expenditures of the United States could be really fairly charged to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that Gen. McIntyre has given these figures in great detail.

Mr. HARDWICK. I have read them.

Mr. LIPPITT. The statement that the Senator from Nevada made is a statement that has been heretofore made on the floor of the Senate two or three times.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir; it has been repeatedly made.

Mr. LIPPITT. They are estimates made by different Senators. I myself do not know where those figures come from.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Georgia if he objects.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all right. It does not make any difference.

Mr. LIPPITT. On the other side of the proposition we have the fact that the trade of the United States with the Philippine Islands has gone ahead in a very remarkable manner. In 1900 the exports from the United States to the Philippine Islands were \$3,500,000, in 1909 they were \$10,000,000, and in 1914 they had gone to \$22,000,000. To-day practically the exports from this country to the Philippine Islands amount to \$25,000,000.

Mr. HARDWICK. And in my judgment it is costing us more than the total amount of our export trade with those islands to keep them.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Georgia has any figures which justify his estimate, I would like to hear them.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will be glad to give the Senator from Rhode Island the reasons for my statement.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I was just going to suggest that I thought the controversy, as is nearly always the case in a controversy, is because two propositions are involved. Gen. McIntyre assumes in his statement to give what the records say is the actual cost of maintaining our Army and transport fleet with reference to the Philippine Islands, while on the other hand, as I understood the Senator from Georgia (Mr. HARDWICK), when he first touched on this subject, he was discussing the probable additional cost to the United States flowing out of the fact that every time we talk of the Army or Navy we have in mind the necessity of an enlarged proposition because of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HARDWICK. And the figures which Gen. McIntyre furnished us, if the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, are probably for the maintenance, the actual expenses of the forces that are stationed in the Philippines, and take no account whatever of the many battleships that have probably been constructed, properly and necessarily, because of our occupancy of the Philippines, and because of our duties and obligations and dangers there, and of the increase in naval armament for the same reasons.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if the head of his party, who now occupies executive offices in the White House, is not urging upon his supporters in this body to very largely increase both the size of the Navy that we have and the size of the Army that we have, and whether that is based upon the necessity of holding the Philippine Islands? As a matter of fact, the Senator knows that there is an enormous movement all over this country for the purpose of very largely increasing both the Army and the Navy utterly independent of whether or not we hold the Philippines. Under those circumstances, it seems to me, it is scarcely fair to try to charge up against those islands a few additional battleships and a few soldiers when we have not enough even including those. However, that is a matter of opinion, I will admit, which Senators can figure in ways to suit themselves, only I should like to have it on its proper basis.

Now, if the Senator will allow me just to put in the other side of the question and to call it to his attention, I shall not further interrupt him.

Mr. HARDWICK. That does not make any difference. I am glad to yield to the Senator at any time.

Mr. LIPPITT. I wanted to say that in regard to our exports to the Philippine Islands, which are now estimated at about \$25,000,000 annually, it has been stated in the Senate that the outside possible benefit to this country of those exports was perhaps 10 per cent, that being the amount that capital might make in the form of dividends or profits out of that business.

Mr. President, I do not myself know exactly a scientific method of figuring the value to this country of \$25,000,000 of exports, but I believe that it will be manifest to anybody who will think the proposition over for a minute that the profit is very much larger than any profit that capital may receive from the amount of business that is done in that way. Of course labor is always very largely employed in the production of those articles of export, and the value to this country of employing its labor is quite as much as the value of employing its capital. Further than that, the actual capital that is invested in a manufactory, for instance, for making boots and shoes, assuming that it may be a million dollars, for the purpose of exporting its product to the Philippine Islands is expended in giving employment in a very large way to the lumber industry, to the iron industry, and to a very large number of other industries in the United States, the products of which are necessary to build such a factory. So I say that I think it is a very difficult matter to accurately estimate the value of an export business of \$25,000,000. I am very sure that it is very largely in excess of any possible sum that could be considered as a profit of the capital immediately engaged in producing the articles that are exported. I merely wanted to suggest the two sides of this proposition to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question before he takes his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he thinks the question of profits to be derived by private enterprise should have any material weight in determining the moral and legal questions involved in this controversy? Has the United States any right to hold those people, if it should be shown that they are able to maintain a government of their own, because it happens to be profitable to a few manufacturers? Does the Senator think that that ought to cut any figure at all?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have not at any time based my position in regard to this matter on the question of the value of the business that the United States might derive from those islands; but I do think that it is a matter that is entitled to reasonable consideration. The entire policy of the United States has been that they were going to hold and govern those islands for the benefit of the Filipino people. With that policy distinctly stated it would be manifestly improper for the United States to have their conduct controlled or largely influenced by the question of profit to themselves; but when Senators on the other side bring up the question of the cost of maintenance of those islands to this country it is manifestly fair that both sides of the ledger should be stated, and it was for that purpose, with that thought in my mind, which I think is distinctly proper, that I made the suggestion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator from Rhode Island that last June ex-President Taft, in the Saturday Evening Post, stated that when he was Secretary of War the maintenance of 60,000 troops cost the Government \$72,000,000; in other words, about \$1,200 for each soldier. There never have been in the Philippine Islands less than 12,000 American troops, and there were between the dates mentioned by the Senator as high as 40,000 American troops in the islands. I can not see how you can arrive at any other conclusion than that the estimate which has been made by the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, namely, \$26,000,000, is about the correct amount.

Now, with relation to the other matter—because the Senator evidently referred to my speech when he said that I had assumed that 10 per cent was what the exporter from the United States made in his commerce with the Philippines—I want to say that 10 per cent profit on \$24,000,000 of exports which we send to the Philippines amounts only to \$2,400,000. The Senator himself stated that he did not think it was that high. If it is less, then the profit which would come to the exporters of this country will be correspondingly less. As I asked in my previous remarks, is it possible that the United States will continue to spend this large amount of money—whether it is \$26,000,000 or even \$7,000,000—when the profit which comes to the exporters in the United States would be only \$2,400,000 a year? Shall we continue this policy when in other ways we are spending four, five, six, seven, or eight times that amount to maintain an establishment there with a profit to our people of one-seventh or one-sixth or one-fifth of the amount we expend?

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he thinks the total value to this country of an export business of \$25,000,000 is only two and a half million dollars? Does he not himself acknowledge that the benefit of having labor employed is quite as large to the country as in having its capital employed?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is an element; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then, how much would the Senator add to the two and a half million dollars as a benefit to the labor of this country? The amount paid to labor is generally two, three, four, or five times in the cost of manufacture greater than the amount paid in dividends. It would be reasonable to say that of that \$25,000,000 not less than 40 per cent of it is directly paid to labor actually engaged in the production of the articles which are being exported. Will the Senator not add that to the benefits derived on account of that export business by the United States?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I would not add it to that extent; but even if it were 40 per cent—take the Senator's own figures—40 per cent of \$24,000,000 is only \$10,000,000, and we are spending \$26,000,000 a year in order to maintain an establishment there, where by the remotest possibility, according to the figures given by the Senator himself, the benefit could only amount to \$10,000,000.

Mr. LIPPITT. Now we have got the Senator up to admitting that there are \$10,000,000 of benefit to labor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not admit it. I stated that I did not admit it to the extent that the Senator said. I said that even if what the Senator claimed be true—

Mr. LIPPITT. What will the Senator admit? How much will he admit? Is it 30 per cent?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I will not say that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Is it 20 per cent?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Evidently we would not undertake to manufacture things at a loss, and there are some incidental advantages; but I have never heard a Senator attempt to figure

the profit to the country. What are the profits to the Government? Not a cent goes to the Government.

Mr. LIPPITT. Oh, well, Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. These profits all go to some one else.

Mr. LIPPITT. Let us discuss one phase of the question at a time.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. If Senators think they have about exhausted that branch of the controversy, I believe I will proceed.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I think the theory which I sought to establish, the idea which I wanted to put into the mind of the Senator, has been made clear.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think it has found lodgement, and I will be glad to answer both of the Senators' points. In the first place, I think it is very apparent from this that what the Philippine Islands are actually costing us is by no means reflected in the report to which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island refers. Evidently Gen. McIntyre—and I have read his report casually, not with a great deal of care, I will admit—was figuring only on the cost of the troops within the Philippine Islands, and he did not figure the cost of the many extra battleships we may have provided, of the thousands more of soldiers we may have added to our Army, nor did he consider how many more it may be necessary in the future to add both to the Army and the Navy in the way of battleships and of soldiers if we are to keep those islands.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island suggests that the present distinguished Chief Executive is now urging upon members of his own party and upon the members of both parties and upon the country—because it is a nonpartisan matter—the necessity, in view of present conditions, for some larger armament. The President of the United States, as I understand it—although I do not assume to speak for him on this floor or elsewhere—is not advocating and will never advocate anything like a military system for the sake of militarism. He is advocating some increase in our Navy and some increase in our Army because present disturbed world-wide conditions seem to indicate that there may be a necessity some day for defensive purposes for us to have a larger Army and a larger Navy than we now have; but I do not think that the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator can dispute the proposition that, however much we may add to the Army and to the Navy of the United States, we will always have to add some more to both if we are to keep the Philippine Islands permanently.

There are many thoughtful people in this country, Mr. President, who believe that the possession of the Philippine Islands is not only a source of great national weakness to this country, but is a source of ever-present and ever-increasing danger, and that if foreign complications are ever to come to this country from the East they will come because of our possession of the Philippine Islands or because of some question connected therewith, and that if such complications are to arise it will be almost, if not quite, impossible to defend the Philippine Islands successfully against any considerable oriental power. As long as we do stay there, or try to stay there, we are not to be run off by any people on the face of the earth—white, black, or yellow—but we must hold those islands, or, if we lose them, we will be in honor bound forced to retake them if it is possibly in our power to do so. So that the continued permanent possession of these islands, in my judgment, not only increases the danger that this country is in of trouble with foreign powers, but it infinitely and almost indescribably weakens our strong position of isolation from other powers and our strong defensive position against possible aggression from any quarter.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. The fact being that those islands are so far from our shores that we can not easily protect them, is it not also true, in addition to what the Senator has urged, that they are a menace to us, that our sovereignty over them is a menace to them, subjecting them to attacks, if we are in danger of war ourselves, that they would not be subjected to if they were an independent sovereignty of their own?

Mr. HARDWICK. Undoubtedly the Senator's observation is correct; and to that extent it creates a situation that is unfair to those people. If we become involved in war with powers that are able to strike us at our weakest point, namely, the Philippine Islands, the Filipino people themselves will be the first

helpless victims of this yoke that we insist upon keeping around their necks.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I listened with interest to the reading of several platform declarations of the party of which the Senator is a distinguished member. I notice that in those declarations the United States was to guarantee the Philippine Islands a stable government and complete independence, while in the amendment now pending the United States is authorized only—to give guaranty on behalf of the United States alone—

And that only for five years.

In other words, if other nations do not enter into this proposed treaty, to which we have not invited their attention, as I understand, and concerning which we have no promise that they will accede to our desire, then we alone will guarantee the sovereignty of the islands.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment; let me finish the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator believe that we shall have to have either troops or battleships to make that guaranty good, or does he think that we could then do away with the desire of the country and of his party for battleships and troops, for a stronger Navy and a stronger and more efficient Army? How would he enforce this guaranty?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator very frankly. If the Senator would read all the amendment, he would find that the guaranty is only for a very limited period of time—for a period of five years.

Mr. WARREN. That is enough time in which to destroy that country or impoverish this—perhaps both—in order to make that guaranty good.

Mr. HARDWICK. We have the same hazard now, and we should be subject to it in perpetuo, according to the Senator's view, if he takes the other view, whereas under the amendment we would only be subject to it for five years.

Mr. WARREN. I have no such view. The bill proposes, and I hear no argument against it, that there shall be established an independent government in the Philippines; but the proposition now is that two years from now they shall have their complete independence. I believe the time will arrive when such a proposal as this might be advisable, but I think that now is not the time to decide it.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator is in error in respect to that statement. The bill does not so provide. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, which I am advocating, does so provide. The bill itself contains no provision for Philippine independence at any time.

Mr. WARREN. It does provide for independence in two years.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I made a misstatement. I understand the matter perfectly; I have read both the bill and the amendment. I say that the bill itself aims at the complete independence for the islands in time, without naming a particular time, while the amendment proposes to name the time, and a very short one at that. Without having consulted with other nations, we proceed to guarantee for five years the government and put ourselves in the same position in which we are now, and yet the Senator would like to dispose of the matter of having further battleships and a larger Army because we will have relinquished our responsibility toward them. This is I think hardly consistent.

Mr. HARDWICK. I still, with all deference to the Senator's judgment, do not see how the Senator can believe that we will not be gaining if we have to do that for only five years, instead of keeping it up indefinitely, as we will have to do permanently, if we do not turn them loose at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator from Georgia favor limiting our guaranty to five years?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would that not be violating the platform which he has read?

Mr. HARDWICK. No, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will he read it, please?

Mr. HARDWICK. It is as follows:

We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator now is advocating limiting our guaranty to five years. If at the end of five years we have not secured a treaty, then we are to abandon the Philippines to their fate, violating the Democratic platform.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator from Nebraska contend that the Democratic platform has ever proposed that we were to set the islands free and to continue to guarantee to the end of time and through all eternity their independence against any external force? Is that how he construes the Democratic platform?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not now construing the Democratic platform.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought the Senator was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the bill construes the Democratic platform. The Senator is contending here for a literal and technical construction of that platform. That platform provides that we shall guarantee the independence of the islands until we can have an agreement with the other nations of the world to neutralize the islands, yet he stands here advocating limiting that guaranty to five years. Is he living up to the letter of the Democratic platform in so doing?

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the Senator can judge of that as well as I can. My own judgment is that we will be able to conclude the treaties that are necessary within a far less period of time than five years; I do not think we will need even 12 months to do that; but in any event, according to the way I construe the Democratic platforms—and there is more than one platform utterance on this question—and I have said that for a limited time after we established their independence we would guarantee it—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to a suggestion there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The purpose of that pledge, as I understand, was that the islands should be protected by the United States Government until they were able to form and establish their own government. It seems to me a very strained construction that the Senator from Nebraska would put upon it, that this Government is called upon, under the terms of that platform promise, to maintain control over the islands, as the Senator from Georgia said a moment ago, throughout eternity. The promise was only to protect them during the formative stage of their national existence until they were able as a nation to stand alone.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I do not think there can be a shadow of a doubt on that question. Otherwise, language means nothing. Does the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator contend that the meaning of this was that we should guarantee the independence of these people through all time and under all circumstances?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As the Senator asks me a question, I will give him an answer.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right; I wanted an answer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is not what the platform says; but the platform does say in plain English, if the Senator proposes to live up to the letter of it, that we shall guarantee their independence until we are able to neutralize them by treaty with other nations. That is what it says.

Mr. HARDWICK. Suppose we can not secure such a treaty; would the Senator contend—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am talking about living up to the technical letter of the platform, for which the Senator is contending.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I am simply an "onlooker in Venice" so far as the Democratic platform is concerned; but is the Senator referring to the platform of 1912 or the platform of 1908?

Mr. HARDWICK. I read from the platform of 1912.

Mr. BORAH. The platform of 1904 and 1908 are even more specific, and were interpreted by the leader of Democracy in

this country, Mr. Bryan, in such a way that there can be no mistake as to what he supposed the meaning to be.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; the language is a little different; but I have put them all in the Record and the Senator from Nebraska can weigh them all. My judgment is that none of those platforms meant to pledge us to an eternal guarantee of the independence of the islands, but, simply as a matter of reason and common sense, that when we undertook to set up a government for them, a free and independent government that we thought they could maintain, we should, for a reasonable time, while they were getting it started, protect them from outside interference, and not through all the centuries that were to come after they did get on their feet.

Mr. President, there is very little more that I want to say about this amendment. It not only expresses my idea of what the Democratic policy and the Democratic pledge has been through four successive campaigns, but it expresses my idea of what is right and proper for this country from the common-sense, practical standpoint. These islands have cost us not less than \$25,000,000 a year—the figures employed and used on this floor yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Nevada—and those figures are \$1,000,000 a year less than the figures used by the House committee after a careful and exhaustive investigation of this subject. That great cost has been incurred for a trade that has not increased as rapidly as our foreign trade has increased in the same period of time with many a country over which our flag does not fly. So I contend that there is no sense in it from the standpoint of the commercial interests of this country. As a business proposition it has not paid, and, as far as we can judge, it never will pay. It by no means follows that if we do establish a stable and independent government in the Philippine Islands we will not therefore be able to trade with them and to send our exports to them just as we do now. I think the very contrary is true. I can see no reasonable ground for supposing that because we do give them a free and independent government they will immediately quit trading with our merchants and our manufacturers.

Not only that, Mr. President, but it does not seem to me that any Senator on this side of the Chamber, or any considerable number of people in this country, can seriously doubt the proposition that the possession and retention and the necessity for defense of these far-flung islands of the sea, 7,000 miles and more away from our Pacific coast, is a source of constant, of irritating, and of almost incalculable weakness in our system of national defense against any possible danger; that it is a source of constant and growing irritation, so far as our relations or possible relations with foreign powers are concerned. Besides that, it seems to me—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator kindly specify some of the causes of irritation which have grown out of the possession of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HARDWICK. I could undertake to do that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to hear the Senator specify them.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will reply to the Senator in the form of an interrogatory. Does he think that the possession of those islands adds to our chances for continuing peaceable relations, friendly relations, with the Empire of Japan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will answer that question, but of course the Senator is not answering mine.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am answering the Senator's question by asking him one of my own.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am very confident, from my investigations, that our possession of the Philippine Islands is entirely satisfactory to Japan; and when I come to speak I shall give my reasons for it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I shall be glad to hear them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator stated that they have been a cause of constant irritation in our foreign relations, and I now ask him to specify.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will specify. I have asked the Senator a question which indicated what my own mind is on that question. I have always understood in a general way, I admit without special investigation of the question—if the Senator has investigated it, of course he has the advantage of me in that particular—and it is common belief in this country, in many parts of it, at least, and among many people, that the possession of these islands does not help us either to get or to keep on more friendly terms with Japan.

If the Senator can convince us that we are mistaken about that, so far as that source of irritation is concerned I shall

undoubtedly be in error, and shall be glad to be corrected by him. I do not believe, however, and I do not think the Senator believes, or that any Senator believes, that the possession of land in Asiatic waters, in another continent, by a power which insists on the inviolability of American soil, and which insists that no other power on earth shall lay its hand upon any country in this hemisphere, is an act that will be very readily, very easily, very pleasantly received by other powers who yield to our pretensions and contentions with respect to American countries. That is what I mean by a constant source of irritation.

Another thing: How can a Government that maintains the Monroe doctrine, that says to all the powers of this earth: "You shall not lay the weight of your little finger on one of the American countries; this hemisphere is dedicated to liberty and to American liberty and to independence and to American independence," go to Asia and take a country and hold it in subjection, possibly and probably against the will of its people, and violate there the very policy she insists upon other nations not violating here in this hemisphere?

That is another answer to the Senator who wants to know why I think our possession of the Philippines is a source of irritation in our foreign relations.

One more observation, and I will leave the discussion of this amendment to other Senators.

I do not think, no matter how old-fashioned others may regard it, that the principles for which our forefathers fought are unimportant now. I do not think that the right of a people to govern themselves according to their own judgment, according to their own will, according to their own prejudices, if you please, ought to be taken away from them; nor do I think an alien people should be held in subjection against their will by the people of another land. It is contrary to the very genius of American liberty. In the eloquent language of the Democratic platform, we can not occupy such a position without doing violence to the very spirit of American liberty.

I do not want to do anything rash. I do not want to rush pell-mell into foreign entanglements. I would not for a moment imperil American interests in those islands by a precipitate withdrawal. I would not for a moment leave those islands helpless and alone, without reasonable provision for the establishment of a stable form of government, such as they can and probably will maintain.

The amendment offered by my friend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas makes full and ample provision for all that. It gives us a period of two years within which to work out this thing. Within that period every reform suggested by the bill of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska can be carried out, and the government that he suggests in this bill can be set up and established. Within that period the President can secure every American right, property and otherwise, by Executive action, authorized and required under the provisions of this amendment. Within that time ample opportunity will be given for negotiations with the other powers in order that we may make an effort, at least, to secure the neutralization of the islands by the different Governments most interested in the question; and if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is right, and the great island Empire of the East does not covet the possession of these islands, probably we shall not have the slightest difficulty in negotiating such a treaty.

So, Mr. President, from every standpoint—from the standpoint of Democracy, from the standpoint of Americanism, from the standpoint of the real business interests of this country, from the standpoint of its defense in time of war if danger should ever threaten it, from the standpoint of national strength, from the standpoint of national interest—I believe that we ought to move forward in this matter in a somewhat more rapid manner than is proposed by the bill of my good friend from Nebraska, Mr. HITCHCOCK. Although I think his bill is good, as far as it goes, I favor the amendment because I think the amendment is much better and that it is not either rash, ill-considered, or hastily thought out. I hope the Senate may adopt it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, in considering the bill now before the Senate, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], we are dealing with the destinies, the liberty, the independence, and the future happiness and prosperity of a dependent people, made dependent upon us against their will, and by force of arms.

I wish we might for just a little while forget all about politics, forget all about commercial advantages to our own country in dollars and cents, and place this investigation upon higher grounds. I hope the rights of the Filipino people, if they have any rights, are not going to depend upon a Democratic construction of a Democratic platform. We have these people now under

complete subjection. We can do with them what we will. We can turn over to them their government without conditions or qualifications, and leave them to bear the burdens of establishing a government for themselves and maintaining it if they can.

If this were a question of the interests of the people of the United States alone, I should say that the original entry into the Philippines was a colossal mistake, and I should hope we might get out of that country just as soon as possible. But we owe a duty to the Filipino people. We have, without their consent, made ourselves the guardians of that whole nation.

I have been very much concerned myself, Mr. President, to know what is the duty of this Government under the circumstances. Since we entered the islands we have constantly held out to the Filipino people the hope that at some time we would restore to them their own country, and grant them absolute independence and self-government. The question that appeals to me more than anything else is whether we can do that now with safety to the Filipino people.

It has been said here by Senators who have investigated the situation over there much more carefully than I have, Senators who have visited the islands and studied the situation and the people of the islands, that they are now capable of self-government and could take care of their own affairs. If that be so, Mr. President, then I insist that it is the duty of the Government of the United States and of Congress to see that their government is restored to them without any unnecessary delay.

On the other hand, it is claimed by other Senators, who may be equally well informed, that these people are not fit for self-government, and that if we should turn over their government to them to-day or to-morrow, they would become the prey of other nations. If that be so, then it is just as much the duty of the United States to maintain its guardianship over the people of the islands and protect them until they are fit for self-government.

Looking at it from the point of view of the Filipino people, I think it was a great blessing to them that the United States, even by force, took possession of their country and has cared for them in the way it has down to the present time. We have rendered them a great service. We have established a government for them. We have taught them the way of governmental affairs. We have educated their children. We have improved their islands in every possible material way.

Mr. President, I wish this Government might render the same great service to the Mexican people. There are a hundred times greater reason why this Nation should intervene in Mexico and care for its people and establish for them a government than there was for intervening either in Cuba or in the Philippines. We went into the Philippine Islands not for the purpose of conquest or advantage to the United States, I hope. We should go into Mexico with the same object and purpose—not with the idea of conquest, not for the purpose of visiting vengeance upon the people of Mexico for the wrongs they have committed against our own people, but for the purpose of doing for that unfortunate and stricken people just what we have done for the Philippines, and, beyond that, to protect in Mexico the rights, the liberties, and the privileges of our own people residing there.

I am going to support this bill, not because I think it is going to constitute any great advance toward the restoration of independence to the people of the Philippines—it goes a very short way in that direction—but because I think it is a step in the right direction, and because it is another declaration on the part of the American people that they do at some time intend to restore to these people independence and self-government. But, sir, I should much rather see a definite time fixed when we shall return this government to the people of the Philippine Islands, whether it be 1 year or 2 years, 5 years or 10 years, so that they may understand definitely what the purpose of this Government is.

For that reason, although there is one clause in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas that I do not like, I shall first support that amendment. I believe it is right in fixing a time when the Government of the United States shall surrender the Philippine Islands to their people. I think the clause in the amendment which provides for treaties between this Government and other nations, and which guarantees on the part of the Government of the United States the protection of the islands against other nations after we shall have turned them over to the people of the islands, is a very dangerous provision. I should be very sorry to see any treaties made with other nations that would involve us in any obligation, in case of war, to protect the Philippine Islands after we had surrendered them to the people of the islands.

We have had reason to know within the past months that a treaty between nations amounts to practically nothing in time

of war. If we could make a treaty of that kind with the nations that might be interested in the Philippines, if war should come those treaties would be entirely disregarded, and if we should attempt to enforce them it would mean war.

I have been accused of being belligerent respecting our relations with Mexico. I hope I am not. My attitude toward the people of Mexico is friendly and not hostile. I would intervene only for their good and the protection of our own citizens. I am very much opposed to laying the foundation for controversy with other nations by such a provision as is contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. I am in complete sympathy with the object of the amendment to fix a time when the government of the Philippine Islands shall be turned over to their people. I should rather see the clause that I have mentioned eliminated from the amendment. Notwithstanding that and my objections to it, I feel disposed to support the amendment in the first instance, and to support the bill finally, for the reason that I have stated—not because I think it is granting independence now or will amount to the granting of independence in the near future to the Filipino people. It must be a mere semblance of independence in those islands so long as we maintain troops there, and so long as we reserve to the President of the United States the power to veto any legislation that may be enacted, whether the power of legislation is granted wholly to the Filipino people or in part to them and in part to American citizens. That is not independence. It is not self-government.

The immediate effect of the bill is going to be of but little consequence to the Filipino people, in my judgment. The preamble promises nothing. Whenever the question of granting independence and self-government to the Filipino people shall be presented hereafter, whether it be 5 years or 10 years or 50 years hence, precisely the same question will be presented that is confronting us now, namely, whether, in the judgment of the American people, the Filipinos have attained such a degree of intelligence and ability that they can take care of their own government.

So it does not amount to very much. There will be Members of this body when that question arises again who will assume precisely the same attitude toward it that Senators do to-day—that the people of the islands are not fit and qualified for self-government. Some will be found to say, I have no doubt, that they never can reach that stage of intelligence and ability where it is safe to turn over to them the government of their own islands.

I know that there are Members of this body who have swept aside all of these questions, and have considered the question solely from the standpoint of the interest of our own Nation, insisting that we need these islands for our own uses and purposes; that we are building up a great commercial city there that will be of benefit to us in the future; that our trade with the Philippine Islands is increasing from year to year; that we can make profit to our people by maintaining the control of the islands. I am not going to discuss that phase of the question. I have no sympathy with it. I think the United States Government and its people owe it to the Filipinos, under the promises and declarations we have made time after time, to surrender their islands when they are capable of taking charge of them and establishing and maintaining a government; and I am not disposed to go beyond that. I am satisfied that they have now reached the stage where it is incumbent upon us to fix a time when we shall turn over to them the government of their islands, giving us time enough to arrange matters in such a way as to turn over the government to them without complications, leaving them a free hand to control their own affairs.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, which I desired to explain briefly, that I am going to support this measure.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, there are a few observations I desire to submit respecting this bill looking to the relief of the Philippine Islands, and to tender some views I have concerning the amendment tendered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. President, it is reported that Lord Thurlow delighted to defeat both litigants in a lawsuit, and enjoyed the humor of having confused all the lawyers on each side of the cause. I find myself opposed to many provisions in the bill, and much that is in the amendment tendered by the Senator from Arkansas. Some of both heartily meets my approval, much of both my dissent.

But, Mr. President, I approach the consideration of this measure from a little different standpoint than that suggested by any of the Senators whom I have heard. There is in this country the great cry and claimed necessity for preparedness. There is a belief in certain quarters of this Republic that we are surrounded with conditions that at any time may mean conflict

for the United States. It is urged that we should prepare for this by adding to our Army and Navy such reinforcements as will make that preparation appropriate and fitting.

But the very first question is, What is preparedness? Before we can decide it we have to decide what country we are to prepare for. Before this Nation can enter upon the era of preparedness of the United States there must first be determined what are the limits of your Nation, what country have you to prepare for, what particular part of your country is now to be excluded from the expense and obligation of preparation. When that is ascertained, we then know the limit of the country for which we are to provide.

If the Philippine Islands are to remain a part of this Government, then, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has aptly pointed out, we must anticipate the relation they bear to the military necessities of the Nation and prepare for them, extending our fortifications 7,000 miles away, with great seas between, increasing our Navy proportionately, adding to our Army reinforcements sufficient and such other burdens as are incident to an island possession bearing the relation which the Philippine Islands do to this Republic.

On the other hand, if these islands are not to continue any longer an integral part of the Republic, and our responsibility is to cease, then that much in the calculation of preparedness has been solved by having that particular feature of the problem eliminated and that particular element of expense deducted.

Consequently, we must observe that the very first question at the threshold of preparedness is for what country, and that the very first question in this discussion is whether we shall retain the Philippine Islands or not, with a view of arriving successfully, at least to ourselves, to a calculation as to what country we shall prepare to defend against.

Mr. President, I have held views concerning the Philippine Islands not in accord with my party. I have been greatly at variance with the party of my honorable opponents. I feel and have felt that we have never viewed to the full extent what the holding of these islands really meant.

Sensors, it may interest you, a mere passing matter of political history, that I confess to you I was defeated for reelection to Congress upon this issue. After having been a Member of Congress and an officer in the Spanish-American War, returning to Congress again, I opened warfare upon the policy pursued with respect to acquiring the Philippine Islands. Then, returning to the State where I lived, the State of Washington, lying upon the Pacific coast—its citizens feeling a financial interest in the acquisition of the islands—I opposed the acquisition. I was opposed by my own political party at home, where I then lived, and of course I was opposed by my Republican opponents who were supporting the policy of the then President and distinguished citizen of the Republic, William McKinley.

Mr. President, I see around me many eminent Republicans who to-day are conceding the weakness of ever taking the Philippine Islands, and who admit the general danger this possession now forebodes to this Republic; but I recall how many of these eminent gentlemen held the Democracy up to the derision of the country because they sought to remain by the text of the fathers of the Republic and avoid the acquisition, with all the dangers that it promises.

Mr. President, it is not popular in certain branches of public assemblages to refer to the name of William J. Bryan. Certain Senators and Representatives shrink from further reference to that distinguished leader, lest by making reference to him at all they would be regarded as approving or appear to be in opposition to a certain program of the administration. I delight to advert to vindication time has given him. For myself, I oppose Mr. Bryan's opposition to appropriate preparedness in the anticipation of difficulties which any true American must view if he but puts his head out of the portals of his habitation and contemplates the passing procession of the world. But I must do him the justice to call attention to the fact that he was of the earliest statesmen of the Democracy to announce the evil that would be put upon this Republic by the incorporation of the Philippine Islands in our Government, and though condemned as he was as being "unpatriotic," and, with the Democratic Party, criticized as lacking fealty to the President, or, to use that famous expression of the then Republican political cry, "scuttling the ship," it is interesting to recall that his opposition has been justified by time and the attitude of the Democracy has been vindicated by events. Will you not give this just credit to this leader of our times and admit that had we obeyed Mr. Bryan's warning we would not now have this burden and danger upon us? The position of the Democracy in 1900 was then aided by certain Republicans of New England, that the better theory for this Govern-

ment was to adhere to the teachings of the fathers who laid the foundations of our Nation and to avoid those violations which have brought ever upon other countries recorded in history the evils from which we now seek to flee.

It is an interesting bit of legend, Mr. President, that when Guizot, the famous French savant, visited England, while James Russell Lowell was our minister to that country, Guizot is alleged to have said to Mr. Lowell: "Mr. Lowell, how long do you think the institutions of America will remain as they are founded?" Mr. Lowell replied: "Just so long, sire, as the sons shall be true to the ideals of the fathers." It was to that ideal the students of government, the disciples of Democracy, sought in 1900 to point to the people of this Republic.

Mr. Gladstone previous to his death, in a very celebrated discussion in public life, turned apart from the subject of his oration to make an apostrophe to America. He called the attention of his own nation to the splendid attitude we held in what he termed to be our self-protection. He alluded to the isolation we bore, the protection of the seas on either side, and added that so long as we adhered to the limits of our own Republic, as had been our course, none of the dangers would beset us which had afflicted his own country.

However, Mr. President, the sons of our fathers some generations removed were not particularly influenced by the advice of Washington, the wisdom of Hamilton, the admonitions of Jefferson, or the traditions of the Republic, but under those peculiar influences that ever attend opportunity, where commercial benefit may follow the fawning upon political administrations, under all political parties, in every change, we were induced to remain in those islands, producing a menace to the Government and an injury to its occupants.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] took issue with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] in his observations that the islands were an irritation to this Republic. My able friend, the Senator from Nebraska, asked the Senator from Georgia in what detail would he say those islands were a menace and irritation, and the Senator from Nebraska gave us the assurance that he had it from those in whom he confided, being officials of Japan, that our holding the islands was not disagreeable to Japan, or, if I may use the expression of my able friend, that they had no opposition to such.

But I invite the attention of the Senate to some history. First, my mind reverts to a splendid little brochure written in England by Sir Henry Wotton. It is upon diplomacy. He opens his little treatise with this observation: "A diplomat is a man selected to lie abroad for the benefit of his country," and then, apropos of the oriental diplomacy, he says: "Of all diplomacy that which is designated oriental is the most intricate; its first text is always to say that which pleases the situation then in hand."

That the able Senator from Nebraska may have had from those representing oriental diplomacy representations that may please the situation in hand I have never a doubt, but I ask his statesmanship, Does he feel that under any conditions through which we could remain in those islands for any length of time and still execute our doctrine of exclusion of Japanese and Chinese in the Philippine Islands or the mainland without protest from Japan and China? Then does my able friend answer that Japan nor China would allow us leave to keep their people out of the Asiatic zone? When we had entered into their zone in direct violation of our theory of the Western Hemisphere for the western people, it is such that gives the irritation now existing.

I recall to the Senator from Georgia, without injecting anything interfering with his speech—I could recall to his memory some history, and to my friend from Nebraska I beg to revive it: When we took possession of those islands and issued the manifesto assuming civil government, we sought to spread, as it were, and enforce the doctrine of the exclusion of Chinese and Japanese. Promptly upon doing so both Governments of China and Japan made such protest that it became necessary for this Government at once to make negotiations with Gen. Otis, then in command, and to withdraw the assertion by America that only Americans were to enter into the new American territory.

Later when Japan made her protest against separate schools in California, as the able Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] will probably recall, and when we were not in a condition that would particularly authorize us at that time to enter into a conflict with any people, what was it that Japan did? Japan made a protest to this country against what she felt was the humiliation of her people. So serious was the situation, in view of legislation threatened by the legislatures then of Washington, Oregon, and even New York, that the two oriental Govern-

ments took such exception to our attitude as to manifest it by a temper far from serene.

Conscious of my place, Mr. President, I am forbidden here to use expressions which otherwise I would employ applicable to their attitude at that time. Suffice it to say to the verities of history, President Roosevelt, with whom I have been from time to time in much opposition and whose views I have not always concurred in, yet concede as a patriot, realized as a historian the true condition of this Republic. He recognized that the protest of Japan was based upon the theory of either reciprocity or retaliation. We could not go into their country and demand protection for Americans to the same extent that the Japanese were protected in Asia and yet decline to the Japanese in this country the protection that we gave to Americans. As we could not grant reciprocity without the destruction of labor and serious assaults upon the domestic institutions of America, retaliation became necessary and natural from the orientals, not because those in the governmental administration desired war, because, Senators, we recognize in history that it is not administrations in power that bring on war, save perchance the case of Napoleon III, which arises in our mind as an exception—but it is the party out of power against the party in power which holds against the party in power that they have allowed the Government which they presumed to represent to be humiliated by being presented in a light wherein it is discriminated against on the one hand or its people insulted on the other. This forces the conflict. Consequently it is the man in the street, not the woman in the house, who makes war. Japan was in this interesting situation. She had lately come out of a successful war with Russia. Figuratively speaking, her galleons were smoking at cannon mouth, and black lipped, hovering in their harbors. Her soldiers still carried upon their shoulders knapsacks triumphant and ready for war, and their guns were well trained.

That President Roosevelt, a soldier, would understand the situation we will not deny. Senators who were here in 1906, may I invite you to something of your history? An American President of the United States sent a message to the Houses of Congress in which he recommended that the Army and Navy be put at his service and that he should execute by aid of them the treaties; meaning that treaty with Japan which he then insisted gave her reciprocal rights against the States. To that message, Senators, he appended that remarkable utterance which has not been quoted before the country and out of patriotism of the public press has been suppressed. President Roosevelt recommended the naturalization of the Japanese by law in America, to have done which would have readily put enough votes in the hands of several States on the Pacific coast at any election involving Representatives and Senators to have overturned the Republic in all its vast principles, in all its theories, because there would have been a sufficient number of Japanese alone in certain States of this Union to have controlled the majority vote, and the balance of power would have made Representatives and Senators dependent upon their political power.

Do you think that President Roosevelt really meant that message? I could never believe that he ever meant it. Do you fancy that he would have ever expected the American Senate and the American Congress to have passed a law naturalizing the Japanese, placing them in all respects upon an equality with the workers of America?

Apart from the natural fear of the inheritance of a political result of such a condition, his patriotism, let us believe, would never have indulged him to do it and never would have justified such a consequence. What was in his mind? It was to propitiate the threatened hour that was upon this country then, which clearly was this, I may say to the junior Senator from Georgia in connection with his response to the able chairman of the committee.

You hear much of gentlemen who say, should we have a quarrel with China or Japan, a million men would rise in this community here and there and march to the Pacific coast to meet the advance of the enemy. Do you think the enemy would advance to you when you have put an insult upon her citizens and refused them recognition in the Republic, denied them equality with what you demanded for Americans in Asia, and awakened their affront? Do you think they will come to the Pacific coast to assail you? You taught them better. When you had a grievance against Spain did you go to Madrid or Barcelona or Cadiz? No; you seized Cuba at the door and told Spain to come and get it. Your oriental foes would seize the Philippine Islands and say to you, "Gentlemen of America, come and get them."

With your present conditions of shipping, excepting the registry now being used for ordinary shipping purposes, without a military commandeering by your Government, it would take

you two years to land 50,000 men in the Philippine Islands, and with every available ship commandeered from the registry as now permitted it would take you six months. In the meantime your vessels would be met by the active and energetic navy of your opponents off Hawaii, with result easy to contemplate. Then I say to the able Senator from Nebraska that the remark of the Senator from Georgia that these islands were a constant irritation is borne out by every experience of history with which we have to deal or with which we have in the past dealt concerning them.

Mr. President, I am addressing myself, you see, to what I said at the outset was a necessary consideration of that thing called preparedness. If we are to have preparedness, the first question is, What country are you to prepare for? Where shall be the limit of your country? What shall be the defense of it? What shall be its extensions, and then what area are you called upon to prepare?

It becomes necessary, therefore, to consider in this question the expense. The Senator from Georgia evidently in his observations here this morning did not have in his hand a report accessible which discloses, apart from what will be \$26,000,000 expenditures for Army and Navy, the civil expenditures in the Philippine Islands which the Government was compelled to advance from time to time. That would have equaled the sum of \$5,000,000 and \$10,000,000 a year in addition.

Therefore, I call your attention respectfully to the average of only the military, \$25,000,000 a year. In 10 years we will have expended \$250,000,000. Then, by releasing the burden of the Philippine Islands, we save the full sum that is essential for the completest Navy that has been suggested for our immediate and modern necessities. Then, without a dollar we have builded a Navy in what is saved in the expense of the Philippine Islands, and we will, then, in 10 years be in the exact position where we would in expense have been had we kept the Philippine Islands and made no addition to the American Navy.

Now, Mr. President, as to the amendment of my eminent friend from Arkansas, having to myself made clear that the islands from a political defense of this Nation should not any longer be held, that they will, if they are held by us, awaken opposition from these countries in Asia, and which I beg to say to you should be viewed, Mr. President, in a different light. I may tender an added light to that which Senators have offered on this floor. It is this, sir: Do you fancy, my brother Senators, that when this war is over Japan and China will not be in a different position than they have ever been in the history of our public lives? If in the past there has ever been any diffidence on the part of those nations to resent what they thought was an affront to their people either from weakness on the part of one oriental nation or the inappropriateness of another, do you feel that the future will leave them in that position?

The able Senator from California a moment ago remarked that we have had occasion to see how treaties were of no value whenever the defeat of them or their destruction would avail the present hour of any necessities. Particularly is this true in military conquest. On the other hand, I likewise invite your attention to what is meant by the word "alliance." Let us view for just a moment one real situation, Senators. No alliance is ever made by any country except with a hope of an advantage to itself, however much the advantage may appear to others at the time. When this war is concluded and Japan shall have had a grievance against the United States of any nature, what do you think she will do? Do you not know that Japan will say to England and to France, "Gentlemen, when you were in trouble I entered into an alliance and gave my support to you. Now, I demand that you shall, as against America, in reciprocity for the support I have given you in your war with Germany, join me, Japan, in a demand on America that she grant to the Asiatics the same right in America that she is granting to the Englishman and the Frenchman." What will France and England do? And then Russia, likewise the same demand upon her, what will Russia do? Do you fancy, Senators, that they will be in any position to aid us. Where is that citizen of our community who indulges in the dream that we can look to England for aid in the event of any quarrel or dispute with any nation in the world?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit an interruption?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LEWIS. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it not true that Canada has taken the same position with reference to Asiatics as we have, and that

Australia also has done so? I am not clear on that subject, but it seems to me that I have read something to that effect.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am unable to reply that those countries have taken the same position, because I do not know their exact position; but this much can be said, that Canada has lately enforced exclusion by keeping out even the Hindus of India from British Columbia. Australia has also passed a law against Asiatics. It is safe to assume that their position is so akin to ours that the Senator from New Jersey is not far afield in the observation he has made.

Mr. President, therefore, let me conclude, and call attention then, as you will observe, that France and England would be in no position to do otherwise than to yield to Japan. Why? In the first place, they would be in debt to Japan for service which Japan had rendered them in her alliance against Germany; and, in the second place, if they should decline to render America any aid whatsoever they themselves would be the subject of retaliation on the part of Japan by driving England out of Japan, as Japan has driven Germany out of China. After the war England would hardly be in a position to oppose or defend, under such conditions, any more than was Germany.

France would not dare to lend us any aid, however much her spirit of kindness or I may say comity, because of her large interests in China. China would be brought in by Japan on the ground of common interest and common welfare, and either by the same force that England now exercises over Egypt and India, to go in with Japan against America, or out of a common cause of grievance. Think you, Senators, that if we continue, therefore, our position in the Asiatic sphere we would not visit upon us those very evils which you now see visited upon England, France, and Germany in their conquered colonial possessions?

It must be then apparent that before we proceed upon the program of preparedness this question as to the Philippine Islands must first be determined in one way or the other—that we either keep them and fortify the Navy sufficiently in its doubling capacity to maintain them as against every assault, or that we should get out of there, return to the confines of our own Republic, and prepare our defense for our own country in the splendid isolation to which the great Gladstone aptly referred.

Mr. President, there is one feature in the pending bill which gives me great concern.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Illinois has evidently given a great deal of consideration to this matter, and I should like to submit this situation to him: As I understand, we do not exclude the Japanese or the Chinese from the Philippine Islands, but we do, of course, exclude and place a limitation upon the immigration of people of those nationalities into this country. Would it not be true that the same preparedness would be necessary in a sense even if we should give up the Philippine Islands? In other words, after the war would not Japan feel just as strongly that her people should be placed upon a level with the other immigrants to this country should we give up the Philippine Islands as if we should hold them?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho is interesting, because it suggests a thought which it is well to dwell upon at this juncture. It is this: So long as we remain in the Philippine Islands, we are then in Asia. The right of Asia to demand reciprocity to come into America appears to be equitable, and the right to exact or enforce retaliation if we could not yield that reciprocity would likewise appear to be justice. The foreign nations of the world could be appealed to by Japan for it on the ground that we were remaining in Asia and yet refused to let their people come to America. The foreign nations of the world, the European nations, therefore, would have that argument against us and in their favor for declining either to aid us or as a justification of their cooperation with Japan; but when we got out of Asia, and Japan no longer had the equity to demand reciprocity upon us or to threaten retaliation, then there would be no justification for Japan demanding of the foreign countries cooperation in her behalf actively or for sympathy against us positively. To that extent we remove the righteousness or the equity of the claim of Japan for her people to come into our country and we remit her—I would say to the learned Senator from Idaho—to the single right of merely basing it upon a mere desire to be equal to that which citizens of other nations enjoy. To that we could answer that our opposition was based on the theory of the Anglo-Saxon unity—the Caucasian exclusion—as distinguished

from that of the Asiatic, whereas in the other event, when we went into Asia, we foreclosed ourselves from taking the position of "Asia for Asiatics; America for Americans." That, I would say to the able Senator from Idaho, is the distinction I make.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he would give independence to the Filipinos in two years simply because this Nation stood in fear of Japan?

Mr. LEWIS. Has the Senator concluded his inquiry?

Mr. COLT. Might I further say that I do not fully agree with the Senator from Illinois as to the danger of this Republic possessing a colony in the Far East. I appeal to history. The Netherlands have held Java for several centuries; the French have far eastern colonies whose population amounts to 30,000,000; the colonies which the British Empire has held for generations comprise nearly one-fifth of the globe. Now, shall we change our policy toward the Philippines because we are in fear of Japan, whose population does not exceed fifty-five or sixty millions, and who is now burdened with a heavy debt and excessive taxation?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, no man more than I respects the juridical learning of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, lately honoring the bench, and recognizing his historical information, I likewise pay tribute to it; but I would have the able Senator understand, in the first place, no one here says we stand in fear of Japan. America fears no nation. She seeks to avoid any conflict from unnecessary danger to herself. As to Java, that Java is a possession maintained, it is true, by the Netherlands, or Holland. It has been maintained at great expense; sometimes Java has managed to pay its own expenses, but the colony possession is the theory of kingly governments, not republics. I may say to my learned friend likewise so New York, once New Amsterdam, was also the property of Holland. By going out into these possessions Holland ran the risk of losing them. She is every hour now in tremulous difficulty and serious apprehension that she will be involved in the present European war, and in her struggles of neutrality she is menaced with the fear of Java being seized and herself forced to the violation of that neutrality which she so seriously is seeking to maintain—and declare war. So Holland can not be held out as a precedent to us, nor that because others have not been able to avoid trouble as a result of their policy that we should enter upon a similar course.

On the other hand, it is true, the Senator says, as to France, that France has maintained foreign possessions, and I invite the attention of my learned and able friend to the fact that her possessions in Morocco have been the subject of such warfare and expense as to bring about five civil revolutions at the ballot box in France and the overturning of three French premiers. Her movement in Madagascar brought about a massacre of her people and troubles to an extent serious beyond calculation. This very European war to-day, I say to the able Senator, that is splashing the very stars with blood, is the result of the movement of France into Morocco. If it had not been for the incident at Agadir, Morocco, where France sought to extend her possessions in Morocco over that which Germany contended she had a right to enjoy, and had not England joined France in this matter against Germany to preserve colonial possessions in Morocco, there would have been no concerted movement upon the part of Germany to avenge what at a later time she has—as the present war discloses—endeavored to.

This world war in Europe is the result of the colonial conquests of France and England in Morocco. Shall we emulate these examples, I may ask my learned friend; shall we bring upon ourselves likewise the inheritances which all of these nations to which the eminent Senator alludes have brought upon themselves? Let us pray, never! Therefore, I am unable to see the parallel, save that it is interesting as history, and, of course, is true, as it is established in mistaken statesmanship and in the experiences of those to whom he has alluded.

Mr. President, I come, therefore, to the conclusion of my remarks—I did not expect to take so much time from my colleagues—what, then, shall be the disposition? This bill has been adroitly prepared; of course, it has been industriously prepared. It is impossible for a bill of this nature to comprehend the desires of all. In the Philippine Islands there are many Americans who desire to remain there and who desire that the islands shall remain American. There are other interests that fear our getting out, lest their interests shall be jeopardized.

There are conflicting associations in the islands of race, religion, different political cults and creeds, which make very embarrassing the adjustment. I may cite one of my own experiences.

In my own travels through the islands I was interested to note that in one place I was unable to ask for my ordinary food through my interpreter, as he could not speak the language which was spoken there, and that was 700 miles from the place whence he had gone. It is interesting to note how little really the Filipinos understand in many of those islands the theories of our Saxon civilization. I may interest you in an incident more humorous than important. It had gone out from military headquarters that the people must cease to have celebrations when American officials arrived, as it was exhausting the revenues of these poor people to provide such entertainment. It went out to the underalcaldes that there should be no further contributions to entertain such visitors, except as voluntarily given; that there should be no more enforced or suggested contributions on the part of the people or the petty officials. Then there went out from the Filipino underofficials an announcement in the following form: "Hereafter whenever American officials visit the islands there shall be no more contributions to entertain them, except voluntarily, but those who do not volunteer shall be fined 5 pesos." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, therefore, as the Senator from Nebraska said yesterday, observing to the Senator from Rhode Island, the bill is essentially a compromise. It had, of course, to consider the interests brought before the committee that are equitable, and in many instances I fancy there are provisions which, if left to the committee, to their own consideration, would not now be contained in the bill, yet there are provisions in the bill which, to my mind, seem wholly unserving to the objects to which they are addressed.

I am unable to see under the bill how we shall escape serious difficulties of responsibility and yet exercise, within the time provided in the bill, no power. I fear the responsibility we assume under the bill will entail upon us both expense and injury, leaving us, however, no voice whatever by which we could, within the length of time provided in the bill, have corrected the evils which we may see at the time were being put upon us.

The Senator from Arkansas, anticipating some of these difficulties, has proposed an amendment, in some respects appealing much to my judgment, in other respects inviting my apprehension of danger. I invite his consideration, knowing him to be an able constitutional lawyer, to this point: I ask him, as a test of his proposed policy, in what manner would the United States be able to enforce any arrangement contemplated with foreign nations by the amendment tendered by him? I suggest to him the difficulty that is in my mind. I have no doubt he has pondered over it, knowing the studious consideration he gives to everything he presents. We can only make an alliance respecting any guaranty provided in his amendment either with Japan, under an Emperor, or China, under one that it is now proposed, or we must make it with countries having interests in the Orient in order to have it effective at all, which must be Great Britain, under an Emperor, or Germany, under an Emperor, unless we conclude that France has enough interest. Then, we have an agreement with these nations, we will say, under the amendment, and they agree with us that they shall maintain what would be called the neutrality of the Philippine Islands for the stated length of time. I ask the Senator, should there arise reasons, military or commercial, which because of the nations with which we contract they desired to extricate themselves from the responsibility and turn against us and oppose our interests, in what way does the able Senator feel we could at all enforce the contract or continue it?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, if the nations should enter into a reciprocal convention to protect the neutrality and independence of the Philippine Islands for a given period of time, and any one of them should subsequently desire to withdraw from that engagement, it would be a matter for consideration by the signatory powers. I do not know just exactly how it would originate in any particular case. The amendment I have offered provides that the guaranty of sovereignty of the Philippine Islands shall be a mutual guaranty, neither one standing as sponsor for the other. The guaranty would be made not by one primarily, nor for another, but by each nation for itself. If occasion should unhappily arise where it was necessary to maintain that guaranty against one of the signatory powers, I presume the usual methods would be resorted to to do that. It would either be the subject of further diplomatic consideration or, if it were a matter of sufficient importance and the occasion justified it, the last word in international controversies, which is war, would be the inevitable result.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator has anticipated the very danger that I felt his amendment would suggest.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, at this moment, who desires to propound an inquiry.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he contemplates by that idea some such joint treaty as was entered into by certain of the European powers to guarantee the independence of Greece in view of the present condition of Greece under that guaranty?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That matter is not foreclosed by the amendment down to the last element of detail. That could be left to the representatives of the governments who negotiate the convention or treaty. If the necessity for assuming more responsibility than some Senators would now suggest should arise and be justified, and it should be agreed to by the President and ratified by the Senate, I presume the nations would live up to whatever obligations they assumed in that connection.

I am not prepared at this particular time to forecast just exactly what should be the ultimate terms in which the negotiations should be expressed, and no one else is. I take it for granted that if other nations joined us in that guaranty of independence to those people, who in themselves are innocent because they have no wide international connections that would jeopardize the peace and happiness of any other country, they would expect in good faith to live up to it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me one more interruption?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to suggest not only the fate of Greece under such a guaranty, but the fate of Belgium under a similar international guaranty.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The fate of a nation only concerns the particular nation. Each one works out its own future in the light of the circumstances that exist at the time these exigencies occur.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me just a moment—

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to suggest—

Mr. LEWIS. I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has some rights. The Chair asked the Senator from Illinois whether he yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LEWIS. Did the Chair ask whether I yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. If the Senator from Illinois yields to me, I desire to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I shall be very glad to answer, if I can, any question the Senator may see proper to propound.

Mr. COLT. The amendment under consideration provides that we shall transfer the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands in two years from the date of the passage of this bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLT. It further provides that the President shall enter into immediate negotiations with the powers for the purpose of securing the neutralization of or a guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands. Now, Europe is in a state of war. The war may last two years. This amendment is imperative; we must at the end of two years transfer our sovereignty over the Philippine Islands. Suppose the President should find that it was impossible during this crisis in the world's history to carry on these negotiations, would we not be in a very embarrassing position arising from this two-year limitation?

I know the Senator has looked into the subject, but my idea is that the guaranteeing of the independence or neutralization of another nation by a convention of the powers is a very serious and difficult matter, and the point I wanted to raise was whether it would do to have this limitation of two years in view of the present conditions in Europe?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The limit of two years was named because it seemed to be a reasonable one, under all the circumstances. If the refusal on the part of the governments interested in the affairs of that part of the world to enter into the agreement should be based upon a refusal to assume any bur-

dens in connection with the Philippine Islands, two years is an ample period. If it should turn out that their own affairs were in such condition that they were scarcely able at that time to say what they would be able to do in connection with a matter so completely dissociated from their local affairs as that would be, it would furnish proper occasion for the President to communicate to Congress a statement of the fact that by reason of the upheaval in the world the time was inopportune for the undertaking and that an enlargement of time would be necessary. Congress will be in session almost continuously during the next two years, and there can be no difficulty whatever in the face of a representation of that character, in securing from Congress such enlargement of time as the exigencies of the situation as then disclosed might make necessary.

Things move quite rapidly in this day and time; two years is a long period in the history of the world now, when it comes to a matter of avoiding friction and causes of conflict. Governments do not wait long now when they find themselves confronted by a situation that involves their existence or seriously impairs their rights, and I think the period of two years is sufficient; but it is not yet written into the law. If the combined wisdom of the Senate thinks that a longer period than that is required, it is a matter of form to have it enlarged now. I happened to write that amendment, and it occurred to me that two years was sufficient in the light of the conditions as they presented themselves to my understanding. It was not intended even to commit myself unalterably to two years; and, if the full discussion that should take place here about the matter should disclose the necessity for a longer period of time, there would be no opposition, on my part at least, to adopting any other reasonable period that might appear to be necessary.

Mr. LIPPITT. With the permission of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, may I ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will be glad to answer the Senator from Rhode Island, but I dislike very much to trespass upon the courtesy of the Senator from Illinois to answer questions that I may be able to answer later in my own time.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator has been very explicit in his answer to the question of my colleague in saying that if it took longer than two years to get the consent of other nations the time could be extended. What would the Senator do in case those nations refused to enter into such an agreement?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Then any extension of time would be wholly futile; there would be no occasion for asking for any length of time. We would do as the amendment says the Government should do. I would let the Government of the United States extend its present existing responsibility for five years longer. I would not take upon myself any additional obligation, but would simply extend the already existing obligation to protect their sovereignty and peace, and at the end of five years, I take it for granted, there will be a Senate and a House of Representatives here composed of Members who will be just as patriotic as we are and just as capable of dealing with the problems of that day as we think we are of dealing with the problems of to-day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want it understood that I did not intend a moment ago, when I rose to ask the Senator from Illinois a question, to trespass upon the rights of the Chair.

Mr. President, I want to suggest, in connection with the question which was propounded to the Senator from Arkansas, that it strikes me that in forming the proposed governmental alliance for the protection of the integrity of the Philippine Islands after independence shall be given them, or, in other words, after the rights which the American Government has usurped in the Philippine Islands shall be restored to the citizens of the Philippine Islands, we are to indulge the same presumption that the nations are going to live up to their obligations that we do in all other matters of treaty. If you can not trust them in this instance, how can you trust them in any other?

Furthermore, as the Senator from Arkansas says, it is a matter that has to be dealt with when it arises. If it should be to the interest of any of the nations to withdraw from the agreement, if they should impair their own integrity or their own welfare by their adherence to it, they might be able to withdraw from the compact with honor; but that is a bridge

to be crossed when we reach it. I repeat that it is entirely reasonable to indulge the presumption that the nations are going to live up to their contracts, and the suggestion to the contrary is no valid objection to the proposition embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I should like to indulge that my humane friend the able Senator from Mississippi confides, and that is that a treaty gave such assurance that the mere making meant the obedience; but late events have brought to my attention the fact that the strength of treaties seems to be no more than that of a decree written by a sunbeam upon a snow bank. The very first blaze that bursts upon it melts it into nothingness—or the history of the later months all around us means nothing.

The able Senator from Arkansas, with the frankness that characterizes his course on this floor and elsewhere, has conceded the very danger that my apprehension admonishes me would follow a provision that is in his tendered amendment. First, Mr. President, we could only enter into agreements under this amendment with monarchical countries; and the very moment we enter into an agreement with Japan, or with China and Japan, we make them partners with us in a common enterprise in Asia. We have then violated the very first admonition of the first father of the Republic. We have entered into "foreign entanglements." Second, we have entered into a contract with those with whom we could not enforce it except by giving to them that which we would not yield. When we ask them to protect our property or our interests, they have a right in turn to ask us that which we could not give, perchance—the recognition of their citizens in our country upon equal terms with Americans. That would be their first demand. Second, the very first time there came the slightest friction in the then government of the Philippine Islands that did not harmonize with the interests of either one of these contracting parties they would either withdraw or visit penalty upon those who violated what they thought right. This would be conflict. What would be our attitude? As the able Senator admirably says with commendable frankness, it would be to protest. We would stand on our rights; and then, if we found a difference, finally it would reach to the sure conclusion that we would be compelled by force of arms to enforce the contract or punish its violation, and that would mean war, when we are seeking now to do a thing to get us out of the prospect of war.

When I advise my able friend from Arkansas that one of the distinguished citizens of the Republic, who was formerly President of the United States, is monthly addressing himself to his countrymen in articles against what he calls the evil of his Republic, the crime of supine America, and the offense of a cowardly President, because we did not go into war in behalf of Belgium, giving as a reason that there was a compact on the part of America, made at The Hague, which made us a party inferentially and sentimentally, sympathetically, at least, with what was called the neutrality of Belgium, and the able ex-President of the United States, a scholar of history, absolutely urges that it was our duty to have avoided what he calls the "brutalizing of Belgium" by going into war—in the European war—the able Senator will realize, I am sure, that the same logic would apply in this instance, that if we entered into a partnership with these foreign countries to protect possessions or property of ours or citizens of ours, nationals of ours, we would be in the position where if it was violated, or where we would be called on to enforce it, war must follow. If we enter into a contract we can not enforce, that seems an idle performance. To enter into one we expect to enforce, when the only enforcement must essentially mean, in the final analysis, war—war to the death—would mean to have the islands involved in turmoil, ourselves in conflict, the very thing we hope to extricate them from and rescue ourselves from.

For that reason I am unable to see the wisdom of that part of the amendment of the able Senator. I see what I think the dangers of it, and I point him out that I feel it violates all the cardinal doctrine of the Republic in other respects. There are many suggestions in other parts of his amendment that can be considered with propriety, and I trust with profit, by the committee. I shall offer amendments to correct the objections as I see them. It is the main principle for which I speak—the returning to America by America, and getting out of the Government business in Asia.

Mr. President, that we should get out of the islands is apparent. That it is profitable to do so, no man will deny. That it is justice to those in the islands as well as to ourselves, all will admit. We are now seeking, at a late day, to execute justice that we long promised and we long delayed. We can, in its exercise before the world, again prove that altruistic spirit that is really ours, by which we seek to do justice to all

mankind wherever opportunity affords. We will do no injustice to ourselves in doing so; but in executing this agreement we have made with civilization to give freedom to the Philippines we will again invite a new confidence and inspire a new faith on the part of those nations to the south to whom we are offering further hope that their association with us will be profitable and will be with justice and profit to them and with no injustice to ourselves.

I feel that the bill should pass, with such amendments as no doubt will be considered later; and I recommend it to its passage, feeling that while, as one of the able Senators has well said, we may not live to see all the blessings that will arise from the example we are setting, and we will not see all the benefits enjoyed, we will, at least, have the consciousness that the great Greek had when he wrote upon the gates of Sparta, as he bade it good-by, the famous admonition:

I am but a mortal, and, like my fathers, must die; but liberty and justice by our words and deeds may live for our children and our country forever.

I thank the Senate for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I can get the attention of the Senator from Missouri, I anticipate that he is about to make a motion that the Senate go into executive session. Is that correct?

Mr. STONE. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at this point. I do not intend to discuss it this evening, but I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and I should like to offer it now, so that it may be read and printed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I was going to ask the Senator if he would not have it read and printed, so that we may consider it to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I rose to do. I send it to the desk, and I will ask that the Secretary read it, and then that it be printed. I offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Nebraska proposes to insert the following:

Within two years after the passage of this act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of not less than five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. Within one year after the taking effect of such treaty or agreement the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to proceed further with the bill tonight?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. STONE. Then I ask that the bill be laid aside.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the Philippine bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is ordered.

SALE OF FUR-SEAL SKINS.

Mr. STONE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back favorably the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell skins taken from fur seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes, and I submit a report (No. 56) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida (Mr. FLETCHER) to the joint resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the joint resolution be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to sell all skins taken from seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes under section 11 of the act of August 24, 1912, in such market at such times and in such manner as he may deem most advantageous, and the proceeds of such sale or sales shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 19, 1916.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

W. D. Jamieson, Shenandoah.
J. B. Lower, Scranton.
George P. Martin, Peterson.
William H. Moore, Shelby.

MISSOURI.

Zachariah T. Casebolt, Miami.
James J. Davis, jr., St. Marys.
William B. Ellis, Elsberry.
Bristol French, Piedmont.
Almae C. Hall, Blue Springs.
James E. Harris, Conway.
Ernest M. Moore, Corder.
L. R. McNatt, Purdy.
William T. Murphy, Parma.
William L. Peoples, Shelbyville.

NEW YORK.

August P. Bolender, Collins.

NORTH DAKOTA.

George L. Barrett, Lakota.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William H. Cooper, Oakmont.
William F. Elgin, Glen Olden.
C. L. Gibbs, Titusville.
William K. Reed, Eddystone.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Richard T. King, jr., Georgetown.
Albert C. Ligon, Orangeburg.
M. J. Spears, Lamar.

WASHINGTON.

Eugene J. Edson, Coulee City.
J. T. Harris, Ridgefield.
U. Kirby Lail, Sunnyside.
Thomas McIntyre, Burlington.
Cleora Steele, Hartline.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John L. Evans, Summersville.
Thomas W. Gocke, Piedmont.
Walter E. Reeves, Bethany.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 19, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude and praise to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, for all the pure, noble, God-like qualities of mind and soul with which Thou hast endowed Thy children, and we most earnestly pray that amid the untoward circumstances of life, the perplexing problems which confront us, and the temptations which assail us we may be able to make dominant in our lives those qualities and develop a character like unto that of the world's great Exemplar, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGES OF REFERENCES—HARBOR COMMISSIONERS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
Mr. OGLESBY. To make a privileged request. I ask that reference of the bill H. R. 3042 be changed from the Union Calendar to House Calendar nunc pro tunc.

The SPEAKER. What is it about?

Mr. OGLESBY. It is a bill which confers certain jurisdiction on the harbor commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii. It does not provide for the raising of any money or the spending of any money.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE AT SAN BERNARDINO, CAL.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CLARK of Florida, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 521, providing for a post office and other purposes at San Bernardino, Cal., and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MEXICO.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent for five minutes that I may read a letter I have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, following the newspaper accounts of the horrible outrages across the Mexican border, I telegraphed a personal and old-time friend of mine residing on the border for first-hand information. I have received a reply from him. I first received a reply by wire saying he could not answer me by wire, but would write. I think the nature of the letter is such that it can well be heard from this floor. I will first read my telegram to this gentleman and his reply. They are as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1916.

Mr. ————: Much interest here in Mexican situation. Will you wire me, collect, full particulars of feeling among the people, and consensus of opinion what action our Government should take.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Can not wire answer your inquiry satisfactory because local conditions. Now is time to take a firm, uncompromising stand and to meet our responsibilities without further hesitation; otherwise conditions will grow worse and difficulties increase. Have written.

Yesterday I received his letter and it is as follows:

January 14, 1916.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: Your message received to-day inquiring as to Mexican situation and attitude of Americans thereto. I attempted to answer by wire, but found that I really could tell you little without running risk of doing American interests in Mexico possible harm. The telegraph office has leaks, and being in a prominent position here my wire would probably quickly find its way into the hands of the Mexican consul to the detriment of our people to the south of us.

The recent outrages and murders of Americans in Chihuahua has deeply stirred the people of the border States. Some of the murdered men are from this section and are well known locally. The return of their mutilated bodies will add fuel to the flame that has been smoldering for the past five years. While I do not look for trouble the situation has some danger of a race trouble. Approximately 1,000 Mexicans are employed here; trouble here would mean retaliation by Mexicans against Americans employed in Mexico, so that not only Carranza but Villa adherents would have their hand raised against the American. The intense feeling in El Paso has not shown itself here as yet.

We of the border have had five years of uncertainty and humiliation; all Mexican properties running intermittently and railroads destroyed; bullets have been fired into our town without hesitation; citizens have been shot, some fatally; over 100 3-inch shrapnel shells burst on our properties a few weeks ago and plant was compelled to shut down for two days. When Villa last appeared, in November, citizens were urged to leave their homes by the military because Villa said he was going to bombard ———. Americans in their own country forced to abandon their homes and to give up their occupations because of the failure of their Government to protect them.

The people of this section feel that there is nothing to protect them not only south of here but to the north. With 7,000 United States troops here, Mexican bullets came over by the hundreds. I was favored with two in my own house.

This is all preliminary to show that the present state of mind of our border citizens is the outgrowth of an accumulated and just grievance and a deeply seated sense of disappointment and shame that we must submit to such indignities at the hands of half-civilized neighbors.

During the recent raid of ——— by Villa the women of entire villages were given over to the so-called soldiers, and such a case happened at ———, about ——— miles from here. Daughters of respectable families were taken from their homes and passed from soldier to soldier, and yet we wait—for what? For just such occurrences as happened in Chihuahua, the murder of 19 fine chaps, whose deaths are but the harvest of our country's failure to meet its responsibilities. This responsibility rests upon us; we may duck and dodge and find plausible excuses, but we have the work to do. If we fail to assume the obligation, we are to be pitied, for no such Nation can last long.

This continued lack of decision and action has led the Mexican to believe that we are afraid of him. During these five years of turmoil he has been supplied with guns and ammunition through our ports, and he has learned how to use them. Carranza is not generally believed to have the ability to put his government over. Villa's game is, of course, to bring an intervention, and the quickest way to do this is to

murder Americans. Each day of watchful waiting gives rise to much more to watch and witness.

To my mind the only thing to do is to demand and see to it that Carranza exterminates these outlaws within a stipulated and short period. This demand will be treated lightly because of soft impeachment of the past, but if definite results and tangible evidence of a successful government are not at hand within 30 days we should take a firm, uncompromising grip on the situation and put it over. I am not for intervention if a decent government could be put on its feet without armed interference, but I do not believe it can be done.

I appreciate that there are considerations I know nothing of, but I believe these considerations are magnified in an effort to justify our miserable, ineffectual, and characterless policy. Oh, for a strong, virile Americanism that stands for something. We of the border hang our heads.

Yours,

Mr. Speaker, this letter is first-hand information in relation to the conditions as they exist on the border, and I think is worthy of the attention and consideration of this House.

FRANCHISES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

When the Committee on the Territories was called,

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 65 for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 65) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii entitled "An act relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved by the governor of the Territory April 29, 1913, be, and is hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows:

"ACT 135.

"An act relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto.

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The franchises granted by act 30 of the laws of 1903 of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved April 21, 1904; act 48 of the laws of 1903 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved April 21, 1904; act 66 of the laws of 1905 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved June 20, 1906; act 105 of the laws of 1907 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909; act 130 of the laws of 1907 of said Territory, as amended and approved by said act of Congress approved February 6, 1909; act 115 of the laws of 1909 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved June 25, 1910; and act 66 of the laws of 1911 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved August 1, 1912, and the persons and corporations holding said franchises shall be subject as to reasonableness of rates, prices, and charges and in all other respects to the provisions of act 89 of the laws of 1913 of said Territory creating a public-utilities commission and all amendments thereof for the regulation of public utilities in said Territory; and all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public works or the courts by said acts granting said franchises are hereby conferred upon and required of said public-utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory; and said acts granting said franchises are hereby amended to conform herewith.

"Sec. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 29th day of April, A. D. 1913.

"WALTER F. FREAR,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Also the following committee amendments were read:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "ten," strike out the comma and the word "and" and insert a semicolon.

Amend, on page 3, by inserting, after the word "twelve," in line 7, the following:

"And also franchises heretofore granted to any other public utility or public-utility company, and all public utilities and public-utilities companies organized or operating within the Territory of Hawaii."

Amend, on page 3, by inserting, after the word "herewith," in line 24, the following:

"Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall in any wise limit the jurisdiction of powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the acts of Congress to regulate commerce within the States and Territories of the United States: And provided further, That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the said Territory."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is for the purpose of ratifying an act for the Territory of Hawaii. In 1913 the Legislature of Hawaii passed a law creating a public-utilities commission with the intention of placing under the supervision and control of that public-utilities commission all of the public-service corporations in Hawaii. Now, it is a fact that a number of public-service companies or corporations had franchises and rights that were granted by Congress. It was not in the power of this Legislature of Hawaii to put them under this public-utility commission. The object of this act and its approval by Congress is for the purpose of putting all public-service corporations under the control and jurisdiction of this act. That is the general purpose of the bill, and the reason for it is apparent

without argument. It is an effort to put them on the same footing and to give this public-utility commission the same power over all these public-service corporations that it has over those it had the jurisdiction to embrace within it by its own act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will this have any retroactive effect on vested rights?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think not, sir. That matter has been considered very carefully, and all these companies that have rights and franchises by the Legislature of Hawaii, or by act of Congress, have the provision attached to acts that Congress shall have the power to alter, amend, or change them at any time.

We have had upon that subject and upon all others full hearings before the committee, and the gentleman can get the facts about that from them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill is, "hereby ratified and confirmed." Should we not take some notice of the fact that it is amended? Would it not be better to insert the word "amended" before the word "ratified," so that it would read, "is hereby amended, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows"?

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman means the title of the act of the legislature?

Mr. MANN. Yes; at the top of page 2, where you provide that the act of the legislature is "hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed." I think you should add a word, and state it is "hereby amended, ratified," and so forth. It would cover the case. Something like that ought to go in to show that it is amended.

Mr. HOUSTON. Perhaps the proper amendment would be, "with an amendment."

Mr. MANN. Perhaps so. Perhaps it ought to be, "with an amendment." But it would be sufficient to say, "it is hereby amended, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows."

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that would be sufficient; and, Mr. Speaker, I offer that amendment. After the word "hereby" to insert the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "hereby," insert "amended" and a comma.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOUSTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the committee if the amendment reported by the committee since the reporting of the bill has been submitted or offered?

Mr. HOUSTON. It has not been. I thought it would be right and proper to offer it later on. However, I can offer it now.

Mr. DOWELL. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HOUSTON. All right.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to offer the amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, after the bill was reported the committee in consultation decided to offer another amendment. It is on page 3 of the reported bill, line 19. The words "or the courts" should be stricken out.

Mr. MANN. The committee amendments have not yet been disposed of?

Mr. HOUSTON. No; I thought it would be proper to bring this up before the other committee amendments were acted upon. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that I called attention to this amendment for the purpose of discussion, and he can say what he desires about it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak on the amendment partially, and I would like to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, strike out the words "or the courts."

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the chairman of the committee, this bill has for its purpose and object the placing of all the public utilities of the Territory of

Hawaii under a utilities commission which was created by the Territory in 1913. This bill was adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii in 1915 and submitted to the Congress for its approval.

Under the provisions of the special acts creating the different utilities in this Territory we find that a great many methods have been adopted by Congress relative to the fixing of rates and to the control of these utilities. The commission is authorized under the provisions of the Territorial law to place all of these public utilities under its supervision and control. While this commission has not all of the authority or power that I would like it to have, it has the power of investigation, it has the power to fix rates and charges, and it has the power to compel service of these corporations. On its own motion it may make an investigation and may examine all the books and contracts of the companies, and may fix such rates as the investigation may show to be just and fair to the consumers or users.

This commission consists of three members, appointed by the governor for a term of three years; and it occurs to me that in order that this commission may have the power to give the best service to the people of the Territory all of these public utilities should be placed under its control and supervision, and all should be treated alike.

Now, on the question of the amendments of the committee, the first amendment is found on page 3 and covers any other public utilities not specified in the original act which may be doing business in the Territory. That your committee believed to be necessary in order that some utility company doing business in the Territory, though not having been granted a charter by Congress, should be placed under this commission.

The second amendment, or the last amendment, provides "That nothing herein contained shall in any wise limit the jurisdiction or powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the acts of Congress to regulate commerce within the States and the Territories of the United States." That amendment was offered by your committee because there is a railroad in this Territory which rightly comes under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and it is not the purpose to in any manner interfere with the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The other provision following is "That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the Territory." This, we believe, should be adopted, because the power of the courts to review the action of the commission in fixing rates and charges, after making this investigation, should be retained by the courts.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that the last proviso is that all acts of the public utilities commission shall be subject to review. It has power, has it not, besides the power to fix rates?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think that all acts of a commission like that ought to be subject to the courts?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Purely administrative acts?

Mr. DOWELL. Congress has heretofore placed all of this power within the hands of a superintendent of public works, and no power is given to this commission, except what was in the power conferred by Congress upon the superintendent of public works.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But does the gentleman think that all of the acts, those acts that are purely administrative, not touching rates and not affecting the finances of the company at all, should be subject to court review?

Mr. DOWELL. I suppose the only question that could be raised would be the question of the reasonableness of the order of the commission.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman mean that this bill will give the court the right to fix rates in the future that would be purely legislative?

Mr. DOWELL. No. It is only the right to review the action of the commission in making an order.

Mr. SIMS. Whether it had exceeded its authority?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; whether it was arbitrary or reasonable; and that power, it seems to me, ought always to be lodged with the courts.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Is any power given to the courts in Hawaii that is not ordinarily given to the courts in the different States of the Union, over the acts and doings and decisions of public utilities commissions?

Mr. DOWELL. I think the act creating the public utility commission provided for an appeal directly to the supreme court, and all of the actions of that commission are by the act itself subject to review by the supreme court of the Territory.

Now I come to the next question, which is the amendment just offered by the chairman of the committee, and which is to strike out of line 19 the words "or the courts." I want to call attention to this amendment, gentlemen, because it is a question which involves the authority and the power of this commission, and also, it affects the power and authority of the courts heretofore granted in the various charters of these public utilities. Under the special charters that have heretofore been granted by the Congress we find that the methods of arriving at the rates and charges have not been uniform.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to read, beginning at line 17, page 3, of the bill, the language which this amendment seeks to change, so that you may thoroughly understand the purpose of the amendment. In line 17, page 3, after the semicolon, I read:

And all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public works or the courts by said acts granting said franchises are hereby conferred upon and required of said public-utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory.

This amendment strikes out the words "or the courts"; and by striking out these words this amendment leaves conferred upon the utilities commission all of the powers and duties of the superintendent of public works, and does not confer upon the utilities commission the power and authority heretofore granted, in each special charter granted by Congress, to the courts of the Territory. I heartily favor this amendment, because I am not ready to take from the courts of the Territory the power and authority vested in the courts by the adoption of these special charters, which includes the power of condemnation of property, and also to forfeit the charters of these public utilities. This is a special power conferred upon the courts of the Territory by the acts creating these charters, and I believe the Congress is not ready to take from the courts the power and authority that have been heretofore granted in this respect. For this reason I hope that the amendment will be adopted; and with this amendment adopted, I believe that this bill is in the right direction, and that we are giving to the people of the Territory a better system and a better opportunity of fixing the rates and control of these public utilities than they have heretofore had. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I have just come in, and I do not know what may have been said. I want to ask the gentleman a question in reference to the last proviso in section 1:

That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the said Territory.

I should like to ask the gentleman in what way that amends or changes the utility law passed by the Territory?

Mr. HOUSTON. It does not change it at all. That is already the law of the Territory, as I understand it, and that clause was inserted in order that this act should not exempt these public-service corporations from the same control that the courts now have.

Mr. LENROOT. Not every act of a utility commission is reviewable by the courts of the States, so far as reasonableness is concerned. Will not the language contained in this bill deprive this utility commission of all power of determining the question of reasonableness and place the original matter in the courts in every instance where the act is complained of?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not think so. Under the law of the Territory now the courts have jurisdiction and the right of review, and in the operation of this law in regard to these public-service corporations no question of that kind has been considered by the courts. They have left the question of fixing rates, and their reasonableness, to the superintendent of public works heretofore, and the proper authorities have had control of that. But this general provision is to cover a case

that might arise, and if an injury or an injustice should be done by an act of theirs of that kind, under this law they would have the right to appeal to the supreme court of the Territory.

Mr. LENROOT. The language with reference to the review is very much broader than the language giving to the courts of the United States the power of reviewing the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and is very much broader than the authority given to the courts in reviewing decisions of State utilities commissions, so far as I know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To interrogate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman from Tennessee explain whether there is any organic law authorizing Congress to amend an act of the Hawaiian Legislature?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; every act. There is no provision in the organic law empowering Congress to do that specifically, but in all these public-service company charters there is a provision reserving to Congress the right to alter, amend, or repeal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then these changes proposed now by the Congress of the United States are in line with the authority heretofore conferred?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; exactly; and these are the changes that have been passed by the legislature. It is the act of the Territory which is being ratified here.

Unless some one else wishes to speak, I ask the Clerk to read the bill.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk has read the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I have just a moment to answer the question which has been asked?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. In the provision of the law of the Territory, section 2234, all of the latitude proposed in the committee amendment is given in the original act creating the utilities commission. Your committee have conferred no greater or different power than is reserved by the charter in creating this commission.

The SPEAKER. Unless some gentleman wants to speak on this, the Chair will put the question. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MANN. There was an amendment offered which has not been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the last amendment reported by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike out the words "or the courts."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the committee amendments? If not, they will be put in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER FRANCHISE IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS OF HAWAII.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6241) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder," is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed, and section 857 of chapter 59 of the revised laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby amended by adding after the words "district of Wailuku" wherever appearing in said section 857 the following words: "And district of Makawao," so that the same shall read as follows:

"Sec. 857. Franchise: H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, together with their associates, hereafter called 'The Company,' and their respective successors and assigns, are vested with the right, authority, and privileges, from and after February 6, 1909, to manufacture, sell, furnish, and supply electric light, electric current, or electric power in the district of Walluku and district of Makawao, on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, for lighting the streets, roads, public or private buildings, or for motive power, or for any other purpose which they may deem advisable, and from time to time for the purposes above mentioned, and subject to the approval and supervision of the boards or officials having charge of said streets or roads to construct, maintain, and operate suitable poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp posts, conductors, conduits, and such other appliances and appurtenances as may from time to time be necessary for the transmission, distribution, or supply of electricity to consumers thereof, under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said district of Walluku and district of Makawao, on the island of Maui, and to connect the said lines, wires, and conductors with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamps, lamp posts, or other structure or object with the place of supply."

Sec. 2. Section 859 of said chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby amended by striking out the word "district" in said section 859 and substituting therefor the word "districts," so that the same shall read as follows:

"Sec. 859. Poles, etc., not to interfere with use of streets, etc.: All poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp posts, conductors, conduits, and other appliances constructed, maintained, or operated under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts, on the island of Maui, shall be so constructed, maintained, and operated by the company as to not unnecessarily interfere with the use of such streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes by the public."

Sec. 3. Said chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby further amended by adding a new section thereto, to be known as section 865A, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, and reading as follows:

"Sec. 865A. This franchise and the person or corporation holding the same shall be subject as to reasonableness of rates, prices, and charges, and in all other respects to the provisions of chapter 128 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, creating a public utilities commission, and all amendments thereof for the regulation of the public utilities in said Territory, and all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public work or the courts by said act creating said franchise, are hereby conferred upon and required of said public utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory."

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States, provided that such approval be given on or before the 4th day of March, 1917.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina makes the point that no quorum is present, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EMERSON) there were 149 ayes and 3 noes.

So the motion for a call of the House was agreed to. The Doorkeeper was ordered to close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms to notify Members.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Farr	Jones	Patten
Austin	Finley	Keister	Pou
Black	Flynn	Kent	Price
Booher	Gallagher	Kitchin	Rowland
Callaway	Gallivan	Kreider	Sabath
Campbell	Glass	Leibel	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Loft	Scully
Clark, Fla.	Graham	Longworth	Sparkman
Conry	Gray, Ala.	McGillcuddy	Stout
Crago	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Summers
Cullop	Gregg	McLemore	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Griffin	Maher	Talbott
Dempsey	Guernsey	Miller, Pa.	Winslow
Dyer	Hamill	Moss, Ind.	Wise
Edmonds	Helm	Overmyer	
Estophinal	Helvering	Paige, Mass.	
Fairchild	Hinds	Parker, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this call 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to. The doors were opened.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the bill.

The following committee amendment was read:

On page 5, at the end of section 3, add the following: "Provided, That all acts of the public utilities commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the Territory of Hawaii."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is an act to ratify and approve an act amending this franchise in the Territory of Hawaii, and I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the only object of this bill is to extend the right of this franchise from the district of Walluku into the district of Makawao, a district adjoining.

The original charter was granted to H. P. Baldwin and others in 1909 for the first district named. It was at that time understood that Baldwin & Co. were to have the benefit of the electric power of the Baldwin Sugar Co., but the Baldwins transferred the right to the electric company, and in this transfer this reservation of power, which had been contemplated would be used by the company, was not secured, and it threw a very onerous burden on the company and made the conditions such that they were unable to proceed with the operation of the work within that limited territory. Being thus embarrassed and hampered on account of the limited territory, they thought proper to ask the legislature of the Hawaiian Islands to grant them the right to extend the franchise to the district of Makawao, and the charter was so extended. A grant was given to the electric company, and this simply is to ratify the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. There are no complications, nothing except the extension of that right. It does transfer all of the rights to the public utility commission which has recently been created there to take charge of all public utilities.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that a certain act of the Territorial legislature, naming the act by title, "is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed," and then goes on to provide that section 857 of chapter 59 of the revised laws, and so forth, is amended to read "as follows," and then in other sections of the bill provides that other sections of the Territorial law be amended to read "as follows," and so forth. Is it supposed that the Territorial act, which is ratified and approved, is set out in the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is not what the bill says.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what the original act says, and that is copied in the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman is satisfied with it, I am not going to complain; but it sets out the title of the Territorial act and says that it is ratified, approved, and so forth, and then goes on and says "and section 587 of chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii * * * is hereby amended," and so forth.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what is reenacted in this bill—the section the gentleman now refers to.

Mr. MANN. The bill differentiates between the act of the legislature which is approved and the section which is amended.

Mr. WATKINS. This charter is simply granted under the statute law of the Territory.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, if I may have his attention, that I have before me the statute referred to there. Chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii is the charter granted to H. P. Baldwin and others. First, there is the franchise; second, the operation, subject to regulations, which is 858; then 859 provides how they must set their poles, and 860 provides for inspection of plants, 861 for being responsible for negligence, and 862 for forfeiture of franchise, and so forth. This bill simply ratifies all of that, but extends it to additional territory, gives them a little more territory to operate in.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking about the form of the bill, which plainly says that a certain act, which it names, is ratified, approved, and confirmed, and as an additional proposition that section 857 is amended by adding certain words, and in section 2 it provides that section 859 is amended by adding certain words, and chapter 59 is further amended by adding a new section. There is nothing in the bill to indicate that you ratify and approve an act and afterwards amend certain other sections. It is all supposed to relate to the same matter. The form of the bill will leave it in dispute as to what is meant.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, while there is no particular objection to having the suggestion of the gentleman incorporated by way of amendment, the only idea is that all the law on that subject matter would remain intact except as amended, and as amended the amendment is stated in the bill. There can not be any doubt about it. There is no reason particularly for inserting the amendment. It will not add to or subtract from the bill. I think it is sufficient, but if there is an amendment offered to that effect we will not object to it.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, if no one else desires to speak, I will ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF HAWAII.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill H. R. 3042, to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, and amending the laws relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1, 2, and 3 of act 169 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, 1915, entitled "An act to amend chapter 49 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, relating to harbors, by amending sections 683, 685, 687, and 691, and by adding one new section thereto to be known as section 691 A," approved by the governor of the Territory April 26, 1915, be, and the same are hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows:

"SECTION 1. Section 683 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 683. Board of harbor commissioners: Except as otherwise provided by law, all ocean shores below mean high-water mark, shore waters, and navigable streams, and all harbors and roadsteads, and all harbor and water-front improvements, belonging to or controlled by the Territory of Hawaii, and all shipping within such harbors, roadsteads, waters, and streams shall be under the care and control of a board of harbor commissioners. Said board shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the superintendent of public works of the Territory who shall be chairman, ex officio, and four shall be appointed by the governor as provided in section 80 of the organic act. Such commissioners shall be appointed for terms of four years or the unexpired periods thereof, in such manner that the terms of two commissioners shall expire every second year. Said terms shall begin on the 1st day of July: *Provided, however,* That upon the first appointments two of said commissioners shall be appointed for terms ending June 30, 1913, and two for terms ending June 30, 1915."

"SEC. 2. Section 685 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 685. Powers and duties of board: Except as otherwise provided by law, said board shall have and exercise all the powers and shall perform all the duties which may lawfully be exercised by or under the Territory of Hawaii relative to the control and management of the shores, shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, harbor and water-front improvements, ports, docks, wharves, quays, bulkheads, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and the shipping using the same, and shall have the authority to use and permit and regulate the use of the wharves, piers, bulkheads, quays, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory for receiving or discharging passengers and for loading and landing merchandise, with a right to collect wharfage and demurrage thereon or therefor, and, subject to all applicable provisions of law, to fix and regulate from time to time rates for services rendered in mooring vessels, charges for the use of moorings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, rates or charges for the services of pilots, wharfage or demurrage, rents or charges for warehouses or warehouse space, for office or office space, for storage of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise, for storage space, for the use of donkey engines, derricks, or other equipment belonging to the Territory, under the control of the board, and to make other charges except toll or tonnage charges on freight passing over or across wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings. The board shall likewise have power to appoint and remove clerks, wharfingers and their assistants, pilots and pilot-boat crews, and all such other employees as may be necessary, and to fix their compensation; to make rules and regulations pursuant to this chapter and not inconsistent with law; and generally shall have all powers necessary fully to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

"All moneys appropriated for harbor improvements, including new construction, reconstruction, repairs, salaries, and operating expenses, shall be expended under the supervision and control of the board, subject to the provisions of this chapter and of chapter 100. All contracts and agreements authorized by law to be entered into by the board shall be executed on its behalf by its chairman.

"The board shall prepare and submit annually to the governor a report of its official acts during the preceding calendar year, together with its recommendations as to harbor improvements throughout the Territory."

"SEC. 3. Section 687 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 687. Rules and regulations: The board may from time to time make, alter, amend, and repeal such rules and regulations not inconsistent with law as it may deem necessary respecting the manner in which all vessels may enter and moor, anchor, or dock in the shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, ports, and roadsteads of the Territory, or move from one dock, wharf, bulkhead, quay, landing, anchorage, or moorings to another within such waters, streams, harbors, ports, or roadsteads; the examination, guidance, and control of pilots and harbor masters and their assistants, and their conduct while on duty; the embarking or disembarking of passengers; the expeditions and careful handling of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise of every kind which may be delivered for shipment or discharged on the wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory; and defining the duties and powers of carriers, shippers, and consignees respecting passengers, freight, goods, wares, and merchandise in and upon such wharf, landing, dock, quay, or bulkhead. The board may also make further rules and regulations for the safety of the docks, wharves, landings, quays, bulkheads, and harbor and water-front improvements belonging to or controlled by the Territory.

"Said board may also, from time to time, make, alter, amend, and repeal such rules not inconsistent with law as shall be deemed necessary for the proper regulation and control of all shipping in the harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and of the entry, departure, mooring, and berthing of vessels therein, and for the regulation and control of all other matters and things connected with shipping in all such harbors, shore waters,

and navigable streams; and rules and regulations to prevent the throwing into such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams of rubbish, refuse, garbage, or other substances liable to make such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams unsightly, unhealthful, or unclean, or liable to fill up or shoal or shallow such harbors, shore waters, and streams, and likewise to prevent the escape of fuel or other oils into such harbors, shore waters, and streams, either from any vessel or from pipes or storage tanks upon the land.

"Any rules and regulations so made shall be published by said board in the manner prescribed for the promulgation of the laws of the Territory, and upon such publication shall have the force and effect of law."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "confirmed" insert the words "with an amendment."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "except as otherwise provided by law, all" and insert the word "all."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that committee amendment and instead thereof amend line 3, page 2, by inserting after the word "hereby" the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment and substitute one which the Clerk will report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "hereby" insert the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "except as otherwise provided by law, said" and insert the word "Said."

Page 6, insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 4. The jurisdiction and powers hereby conferred on the board of harbor commissioners are subject to such restrictions as may be imposed by the statutes of the Territory of Hawaii, and shall be exercised in accordance with the provisions thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the remaining committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows:

A bill to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is that all that the gentleman's committee has?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report a bill to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes. (H. Rept. 57.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I intend to call up the bill to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York gives notice he is going to call up the bill to-morrow? What time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Right after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. Just after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk will continue the call of committee.

BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

When the Committee on Labor was called,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 153, known as the bill to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.
The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by appropriation or other law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor-safety plans and devices of all kinds and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of devices and methods for the prevention of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes to cooperate with such bureau upon request of the Secretary of Labor. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor-safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, very briefly stated, the object of this bill, which received the approval of the House in the last Congress but failed of the necessary attention in the Senate, is to establish in the Department of Labor a function in the nature of a clearing house of information with reference to devices and methods calculated to prevent personal injury and loss of life in industrial occupations.

The ratio of accidents to the number employed in the United States, I regret to say, ranks very much higher than it does in the countries of Europe. It would not be exaggerating the difference to say that the tendency in our industries is to kill and injure at least twice as many for a day's employment as experience shows abroad.

As Members of the House well know, proper attention has at last been given in this country to the subject of these accidents in the direction of making compensation to the victims, at least two-thirds of the States having enacted legislation known as accident-compensation legislation.

It is probably not an exaggerated statement to say, although there is no definite computation, that the accident bill in a financial sense only will mean a loss to the industries of the country of \$150,000,000 a year when these accident-compensation bills have become adopted and applied by all the States.

So, outside of the humane motive of preventing the injury to the victim himself, there is a financial phase of the matter of proportion calling for attention, and the very best attention, on our part. It is to be observed, Mr. Speaker, that in countries where the accident-compensation systems have gone into effect—and I have in mind the British railways particularly—the effect of penalizing the accident by requiring compensation to the victim, without reference to the fact of negligence, has been to cut down and reduce the number of accidents very materially. When the motives of humanity and the financial interests are both joined, it has been found that methods and devices preventive of accident have been called into activity with the splendid results I have suggested in the case of the British railways.

I need not say more—perhaps I was not called upon to say as much—with reference to legislation the commendable character of which appears so obviously on its own face.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the author of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not say very much concerning the bill, because I believe there is no opposition to it. I think there is no service we can render that is more valuable to humanity than to save the life and limb which otherwise would be lost by accident in the ordinary course of enterprise, and the Government can well afford to have experts somewhere in the Government who can give advice and aid to manufacturers in the effort to adopt safety appliances and devices which will prevent accidents causing injury or death.

That is the design of this bill. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and the

other members of the Committee on Labor, which I regard as one of the most important committees of the House, for giving early attention to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, there has been on the part of some in the department and on the part of some gentlemen outside of the department, who are interested in the working of the department, some little fear that this bill might take away from some of the other official bodies of the Government authority which had been conferred upon them by act of Congress. While I do not think that the bill does that, in order to obviate any question and to dispel that fear, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following proviso, to wit:

"Provided, That nothing in this act shall be held to repeal, modify, or affect any other act of Congress in force at the time of the passage of this act."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHILD LABOR.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, if now in order, I wish to call up the bill H. R. 8234, known as the Keating child-labor bill, and in that connection I should like to secure the acquiescence of the House, if I may, to an arrangement tentatively entered into by the friends and opponents of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the arrangement?

Mr. LEWIS. The majority report on the bill has been printed, and is available, but the minority views have not been printed, and yesterday the House gave the minority five calendar days in which to prepare them. I wish to ask the unanimous consent of the House that further consideration of the bill after reading the first section be deferred until Calendar Wednesday next, and that any time lost to-day should be reserved in favor of the bill for a later occasion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title of the bill and first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

To prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine or quarry situated in the United States, which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 and 16 years who work more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m. or before the hour 7 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent that this bill go over until a week from to-day.

Mr. LEWIS. And that the time surrendered to-day, which is about three hours, be reserved for any subsequent Calendar Wednesday for the use of the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is this the last bill that the Committee on Labor is going to call up to-day?

Mr. LEWIS. It is.

The SPEAKER. And that the remainder of this legislative day, say about three hours, although there is nothing fixed about the length of the day, shall be reserved by the Committee on Labor for the consideration of this bill. Has the Chair stated it right?

Mr. LEWIS. On the following Calendar Wednesday. That would be two weeks from to-day.

The SPEAKER. Next Calendar Wednesday is next Wednesday, and not two weeks from to-day.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Labor would have the balance of to-day and next Calendar Wednesday under the new rule. What they want to do is to give up the balance of to-day and, if necessary, have the three hours on the second Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wanted to understand. The rule provides that the Committee on Labor, for instance, have two Wednesdays hand running if it has business. Now, the gentleman asks that this be postponed until next Calendar Wednesday, and that the remainder of this legislative day, about three hours, shall be granted to that committee two weeks from to-day, provided the committee needs it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Rather, I wish to ask for information. As a matter of fact, if we do not object to this at this time, can the objection be raised on next Wednesday as to the extension of this time?

The SPEAKER. It can not, if the committee agrees to do it by unanimous consent to-day.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

Mr. LEWIS. This is a concession to the gentleman's view of the matter. We are ready to-day to take the affirmative argument on this subject and make our argument to the House on this bill, and the minority make their argument next Wednesday, but at the request of the minority itself the majority argument is to be deferred until next Wednesday.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me, before he interposes his objection?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina withhold a moment?

Mr. RAGSDALE. One moment.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina and to the House that the child-labor bill, which is the next bill that would be reported under the call, was reported from the committee on day before yesterday. The views of the minority of that committee have not been prepared, and on yesterday this House accorded to the minority members the right within five legislative days to present their views. It so happens that Calendar Wednesday comes to-day. The bill has been reported, and the report is before the House, but the views of the minority are not before the House. Gentlemen entertaining the minority views very naturally objected to debate upon the proposition to-day before the issue could be joined and their views presented to the House. Under those circumstances the committee was anxious that it should not lose its place upon the calendar, but at the same time that the discussion should not be precipitated when the record was thus incompletely made up. For that reason I, and gentlemen like-minded with myself, requested the chairman of the committee, in order to preserve his place upon the calendar, to permit the committee to give way to-day and ask unanimous consent that its place on the calendar should be carried over until next Wednesday; and in the meanwhile the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of the Committee on Roads, might take up the road bill, which has been reported to the House, so that having gone over until next Wednesday whatever time had been lost to the Labor Committee, by reason of not taking up this question this afternoon, should be accorded to it on next Calendar Wednesday. I think that is a concession on the part of the committee to the views entertained by myself and the views which I understand the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] entertains.

It will be better, in my judgment, that this discussion be postponed until next Wednesday. In fact, I think it would be unjust if it were not postponed. For that reason I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will see that the postponement of this discussion at this time makes for a fairer and better opportunity for gentlemen entertaining his views to present them than could be had if this matter is precipitated at this time; and therefore I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take the liberty of stating to all the Members—some of them are not here—that this Calendar Wednesday rule about debate has been radically changed, and only two hours of general debate are now allowed on one of these bills.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask that the other gentlemen who have bills on the calendar that might be called up whether they would be willing to practically dispense with to-day as Calendar Wednesday and go ahead with the roads bill, so as not to involve matters by having the bills go over. I think they are in very good shape to get their bills up very soon anyhow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on the Revision of the Laws is the next committee on the calendar, I will state that our committee has no objection to that arrangement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday for the rest of the day?

There was no objection.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, the rural post-roads bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, known as the rural post-roads bill, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill by title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; that for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart; that not more than \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

SEC. 2. That out of any appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act and apportion the balance of said appropriation for expenditure under the provisions of this act in the several States in the following manner: \$65,000 to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all of the States as shown by the latest available Federal census and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

SEC. 3. That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act, and the amount of the balance which will be available for expenditure in each State, and transmit a copy of such statement to the State highway department of each State which has such a department, and to the governor of each State which has not such a department; that the State highway department of any State, after receiving such statement, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under the provisions of this act in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State; and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance, and any other information which he may consider proper; that he shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance and what amount of aid will be given under the provisions of this act to such proposed construction or maintenance, which shall in no case be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of what he has so determined would be the reasonable cost of such proposed construction or maintenance, and shall forthwith transmit to said State highway department a written statement of his said determinations; that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed; that thereupon the proper authorities of the State may, in accordance with the laws of such State, commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications; that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction or maintenance of said road; that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon such construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance.

SEC. 4. That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States: *Provided*, That until January 1, 1920, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in any State which has no State highway department shall be available for expenditure in such State in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the governor of such State; that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act as he shall deem necessary, and he may prescribe what reports shall be made to him by the State highway department of any State in relation to any road in such State to the construction or maintenance of which aid under the provisions of this act has been given or sought, when such reports shall be made, and the form and subject matter of the same; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks,

and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere to purchase such materials and supplies and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient.

Sec. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Sec. 6. That all payments of money from appropriations under the provisions of this act shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 7. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

[Mr. SHACKLEFORD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of Federal aid for highways. I believe it is correct in principle, and I believe there is an overwhelming sentiment in the United States in favor of Federal aid to roads.

Our road system is wholly inadequate to meet the demands of this twentieth-century civilization. We inherit our road system from England, a system that England discarded in the seventeenth century. The great fault with our present road system is that it places upon the rural population the burden of building and maintaining 2,000,000 miles of roads, and then we criticize the farmer because he does not give us better roads.

We have made more advancement in the good-road movement in the last 10 years than we did in the preceding 50 years. The reason is that many of the various States have created highway commissions and have entered upon a system of State aid. We want that supplemented by national aid.

The advocates for national roads insist upon several things. One of them is that the amount appropriated by the General Government will be equitably distributed and divided among the various States.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. That is one of the very points that the minority of the committee makes, that this money is not equitably divided. Will the gentleman discuss that?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I will discuss that. The second requisite is that the National Government sees that every dollar expended by the National Government goes on the roads and is expended in an economical way, so that the Government gets a dollar's worth of road for every dollar invested.

I believe this bill meets those requirements.

First, in regard to the apportionment of the money appropriated the bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it not true that this bill does not carry any appropriation at all?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The \$25,000,000 is named in the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is an authorization.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Just simply an authorization. That is correct. Now, we propose to divide this \$25,000,000 and apportion it as follows:

First, we give each State as a unit \$65,000. Then, after deducting the amount that it costs to administer the law, we take 50 per cent of the balance of the money and divide it among the several States according to the mileage of the star routes and rural routes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman what impelled the committee to reach the conclusion that \$65,000 should be given to each State as an initial amount.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer that in this way: We thought that in the apportionment of this fund we would apportionate it in three ways. I will show the gentleman that it is equitable that States which have not a great population or a great mileage, but want to get good roads and want to improve the roads they have, should have something to start with; so we thought that to give each State the amount of \$65,000 was simply fixing an arbitrary amount that we would give to each State for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. What is going to be done with that \$65,000, and what is it given to the States for?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is for roads.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the consideration?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question in arguing in favor of these other apportionments. It

supplements those, and the three apportionments make it so that every State is reasonably provided for.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How is the \$65,000 distributed in the States themselves?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will get to that in a moment. The \$65,000, and all the amounts given to the States, are distributed by the highway commissions of the States, if they have highway commissions, together with the Secretary of Agriculture. I will explain that further on.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman answer my question.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question within the next minute or two. I want simply to speak of these other apportionments.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield until I have made a statement. Then I shall be pleased to do so.

As I said, the first part we divide among the States as units, giving each one \$65,000. Next, we distribute 50 per cent of the remainder among the States, according to the mileage of rural routes and star routes.

The third apportionment is to distribute the balance among the several States, according to their population.

This apportionment I believe is fair. It gives the large State with a medium population a fair show on the road mileage; it gives the small State with small road mileage and a large population a fair apportionment on the basis of population, and it gives States as a unit \$65,000 to equalize the apportionment. It gives the small State that has a sparse population and a rather small mileage something along on that line. So that when you take the three modes of apportionment—figure them out—as you will see in the report, it gives each State in the Union a fair apportionment of the funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I understand that each State is to get \$65,000 regardless of whether it has any highway commission or not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Without respect to the road mileage or the population?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Take the case of a State where they have no highway commission and spend no money on roads, and all the money they get is \$65,000. What will they do with it?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The bill provides that where they have no highway commission the governor of the State shall distribute the fund, and they will have to have a highway commission by 1920 or they will get no more money. Twenty years ago only 10 States in the Union had highway commissions, and now they all have highway commissions except 8.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman said that the State must have a highway commission by 1920. Is it the purpose of this bill not to distribute any money until 1920?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Oh, no; but I say until that time, it is to give the States a little time to prepare themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. And in the meantime what happens to the \$65,000?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I have stated that the governor of the State, with the Secretary of Agriculture, will say upon what roads it shall go.

Mr. MADDEN. How many miles of road will \$65,000 build?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The State gets \$65,000, but it also comes in on the road-mileage apportionment and also the apportionment under population, so that they all get considerably more than the \$65,000.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the scientific basis upon which the committee fixed the sum of \$65,000 as necessary for each State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Sixty-five thousand dollars, the amount specified in the bill, is purely an arbitrary amount fixed by the committee, but taken with the other two apportionments, it makes a very fair apportionment of the amount of the fund. I can not conceive any better way of apportioning funds for roads than the number of miles of road as one element; I can not imagine any better apportionment to go with it than the population, the number of people who are going to travel over the roads. But we want to encourage the small State, the State that has not many roads, has a sparse population, and so we give each State a certain amount as a unit. But the three apportionments taken together, according to the best experts we have, make as fair an apportionment as you can have.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is the apportionment that you have just spoken of to be taken as the future purpose for road building?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As an initial appropriation?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman was a member of the Committee on Roads in the last Congress.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. In the bill passed in the last Congress there is no specific appropriation for a flat amount.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; the apportionment was practically the same as in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. There was \$25,000,000 authorized, to be divided into halves, and there were two bases for apportioning the halves.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The apportionment in that bill was practically the same as it is in this. Now, on the apportionment principle, there are a great many ways which could be suggested for this apportionment. Many of them would be probably fair, but I believe that, taking these three ways of apportioning the fund, it makes a very fair apportionment.

The next requirement is that the money which the Federal Government appropriates shall be fairly invested and economically invested, and not wasted. Under this bill, when the highway commission, if it has one, and if not, the governor of the State, brings out a system of roads and presents it to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture looks over the system of roads and determines what roads are to have Federal aid and whether that aid should be 30 per cent or 50 per cent or any per cent between those two amounts. He also specifies where the roads shall go and what kind of roads shall be built. After that is done, if it is accepted by the State highway commission and the State builds the road, after the roads are built, the facts and data are presented to the Secretary of Agriculture. He looks over the figures. He is having roads built in the 48 different States of the Union, and he knows just what kind of roads can be built and how much they cost.

If he thinks the road has been built in an economical way, in substantial compliance with the plans and specifications presented, he says you can have 50 per cent, or the per cent he has agreed upon. If he makes up his mind that they have been extravagant, that the road has cost more than it ought to have cost, then, under this bill he has the right to give that State commission 50 per cent of what that road ought to have cost. So, no matter if you build a road that costs \$5,000 a mile which ought to have only cost \$4,000 a mile you will only get \$2,000.

You do not get what your road cost, but you get 50 per cent of what your road ought to cost. That is going to have this effect: Every State commission that builds a road for which it is going to receive Government aid, which is cut down by the Secretary of Agriculture in the amount, will be subject to criticism by the people of the State, and the people of the State will go to the commissioner and ask him why he did not build the roads more cheaply. It is going to be a check on every State highway department.

Roads being built in this way in various places in 48 States is going to give the Secretary of Agriculture and his expert engineers data upon which he can rely and from which he can tell very quickly, many times without inspection whatever, whether the road has cost more than it ought to cost. The Secretary of Agriculture can offer suggestions to the various highway commissions, and under the powers given him in this bill he is absolutely sure that every dollar that the Government expends on the roads shall be met by a dollar that the State expends, and the Government and State will thus get two dollars' worth of road for every dollar that the Government puts in.

Mr. Chairman, people term this a pork-barrel proposition. Under a bill of this kind, why can not the Secretary of Agriculture see to it that roads are constructed just as cheaply as the Secretary of the Navy can see to it that battleships are constructed more cheaply than they can be constructed in any private navy yard? If this Government can do other matters in an economical way, why can not it build roads in an economical way? I think it can.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the construction of highways, bridges and culverts are a considerable item of expense?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This bill provides for building highways only?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No; it includes bridges and culverts as a part of the highway system. Some of the Eastern States were opposed to this bill before and are opposed to it now. They say that they are raising more money by taxation than they are getting back. This matter of internal improvements has been going on ever since this Government was started, and the interior of the country, the great agricultural part of the country, has had very few of these internal improvements, and I can not imagine any internal improvement that is going to benefit as many people as will the improvement of our highways. [Applause.] The only questions are whether this money that is expended will be expended in an economical and in an intelligent manner upon the roads, and whether it is fairly apportioned. Those ought to be the only two questions considered.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. As I understand the gentleman, there are three methods of apportionment?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Sixty-five thousand dollars arbitrarily fixed, population, and the length of the rural and star routes?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. All of these three are to be put together into an apportionment to any one State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That being true, would it not be unfair to the great State of New York to give it only \$65,000 and to give \$65,000, say, to a State like Delaware?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do not think it would be any more unfair than to give two United States Senators to the State of New York and two to the State of Nevada.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. The basis of apportionment to the State is, first, population?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. And next, the length of routes?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. What relation does the arbitrary appropriation of \$65,000 to each State bear to either one of those necessities?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It simply helps the young States, like many of the Western States that are just building roads and have not a large road mileage and have not a large population. In figuring up the apportionment under the two items spoken of, it will be seen that some States that need roads, when they complete their roads it will help the whole road system of the United States, and those States are very poor and ought to have something upon some other basis than simply population and road mileage.

Mr. REAVIS. The only basis, as I understand it, then of the \$65,000, is that it is an arbitrary gift on the part of this committee?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Simply that each State as a unit shall have a fair amount.

Mr. REAVIS. Not based upon any necessity?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is based on necessity, and helps out these other two apportionments.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. What jurisdiction is maintained by the Government after the road has been established to see that it has been maintained or continued?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. This amount provides for maintenance and construction of the roads.

Mr. SLOAN. But after the money has been expended by the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. After it has been expended the States themselves have to look after it.

Mr. SLOAN. And the United States gives up this money and has no authority whatever over that road in any way for any length of time after having made the contribution.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think that is fair to the Federal Government?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I think that is fair. I think it is for the interest of every locality to keep up the roads, for the interest of the State to keep up the roads, and when the State puts in a dollar as against a dollar that the Government puts in it is going to see that those roads are kept up in reasonable repair.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose we pass this bill, where does the committee figure that they are going to get the money? How are you going to get the money first in the Treasury of the United States to start with? Under present conditions, where does the committee figure out it is going to get the money?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. We figure out we will get it in the same place where we get it for rivers and harbors—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We have not been getting it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. And are going to get it for the post offices. We were informed within a day or two we are going to have a lot of Federal post-office buildings, which are all right, probably; and we get the money for them from the same source; but we think this internal improvement is certainly more imperative than the improvement of many of our rivers and harbors or the building of post-office buildings at small towns.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will say to the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if we get the money in the same place we have been getting the money under this administration for the improvement of rivers and harbors it is a useless performance to pass the bill of the gentleman. We have not been getting it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. In the Sixty-third Congress the committee got over \$50,000,000, and we only ask \$25,000,000. Then we passed a bill appropriating \$30,000,000 for a railroad up in Alaska for the benefit of 60,000 people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And we have not got it yet.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. We think it is not more than fair to the great rural population of this country which, when you include towns of 2,500 inhabitants, makes over half the population, 50,000,000 people, are entitled at this time to some consideration. That is the idea of this great improvement that it is going to help everybody. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am in hearty sympathy with what the gentleman is saying, and I understood him to say a moment ago that we are going to have a lot of Federal buildings. I would like to know where the gentleman gets that information. I am a member of that committee, and I have not heard of it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The other day the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] gave a very learned speech here and told us the fact that we could look for Federal buildings.

Mr. GORDON. As far as he was concerned.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. And that is all right; I am not questioning it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am not questioning these other internal improvements, but I feel that a class of people whose property is taxed every year for more than \$50,000,000, the rural population of this country, the farmers—taxed over \$50,000,000 each year—that it is high time we paid some attention to them. [Applause.] I think it is time we built a few roads in this country to benefit them. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman about that, and that is one reason I am in favor of public buildings in the smaller towns, to which, as I inferred from the gentleman's statement, he is opposed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I want to finish up what I am saying, and then if I have any time I shall be glad to yield.

Now, we know that the cost of transportation is an important matter to everybody, to the people who dwell in cities as well as in the country, and they claim that about 40 per cent of the cost of every article to the consumer is the cost of transportation. Now, we have improved our waterways so that to-day we can carry a ton of freight 1,000 miles for \$1.25, we can carry a ton of freight in the United States over our railroads for something like 250 miles for \$1.25, but we can not carry a ton of freight on our wagon roads in the United States to exceed 5 miles for \$1.25. Now, if we hope to lessen the cost of transportation the wagon road is the place to lessen it. We pay to-day in the United States to carry a ton of freight over our rural highways over twice what it costs in any country in the world, and anyone who has thought upon this subject at all knows that our rural highways to-day are wholly inadequate

to meet the demands of the traffic that passes over them. I have in my State rivers that have been improved, in my own district, where hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended on those rivers to improve them, and there does not as much traffic go over those rivers in a year as goes over the rural highways that run parallel to those rivers in a week. If you can justify that proposition I would like to have it justified. I believe that it is going to benefit the people of the East in all the States that really opposed this bill in the last session, particularly east of the Allegheny Mountains. Those great States are dependent, somewhat at least, upon the prosperity of the great rural population, the great farming population of this country. They are as anxious about the crop of wheat or cotton or any other crop as the people of the West or the people of the South or any other agricultural community. They have had money for internal improvements. The great Panama Canal, that cost over \$400,000,000, undoubtedly benefited them more directly than it did the great interior or agricultural population of this country, but we have not hesitated in paying this. We are willing even to support, and have for 50 years, the highest kind of a protective tariff on the goods we manufacture, but at this time, after going along for 50 or 100 years, not having any improvements, we say that in making this appropriation for wagon roads it is not asking too much, even if they do not get as much money back as they have to pay out. I want to say I do not concede that the money that comes into the ports of entry of these Eastern States, or any State having a seaport, belongs to them. [Applause.] It belongs to this whole country, and the prosperity of the East or the West depends upon the prosperity of every State in the Union.

The State which I have the honor to represent is one of the agricultural States. Every year for the last few years the value of dairy products alone reached over \$100,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he can tell the committee under what process of reasoning the Committee on Roads reached the conclusion that incorporated cities of 2,000 population should have their streets constructed at the expense of the United States Government while all cities above that population are to be excluded from that provision?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The bill provides that in large villages and cities where the houses are 200 feet apart, and they are on a road that the Secretary of Agriculture believes is a part of a road system, some aid can be placed upon them, but all of this amount is safeguarded by the Secretary of Agriculture. You can not get a cent for any road unless he O. K.'s it and says that it is a road that ought to have Federal aid. He is not going to do foolish things. We have to place in every public official certain discretion and he exercises his sound judgment upon it, and we get very good service from our Federal departments.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman to answer this question.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I would not like to be interrupted on that question further. If the gentleman has another question, I will yield.

The gentleman comes from a large city and represents a large city population, but even in the large cities the road associations favor bills of this kind. There is not a State highway department or State aid in any of the States that applies to the large cities. Some of them give aid to cities as high as 2,000 inhabitants and no higher. Why? Because in cities of that kind they are part of a system of roads and they do not want this road fund to get into the large centers, because it would be swallowed up in the extensive improvements on the city streets and would be lost.

This bill is primarily—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois refers to that provision as to the towns having a population exceeding 2,000, and that provision was included in the bill for the specific purpose

of including in the participation of this fund those cities in New England where the incorporated limits of a town cover many square miles. The purpose of the committee was not to exclude from participation under this bill that section of New England that is included within the incorporated limits of cities, but where the homes are more than 200 or 300 feet apart.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman from South Carolina is entirely correct.

Mr. MADDEN. That would require the Secretary of Agriculture to have inspectors in every town of the United States to find out every year how close the houses are together.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The State will take care of those things themselves. Every State highway commission that apportions these funds gives them to the rural communities. This road bill is primarily for the benefit of the rural highways and not for the city streets in the big cities.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman concede—

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield to interruptions.

Mr. MADDEN. This is not an interruption. I am just asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking this question in perfect good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to the floor, and the Chair hopes there will be no interruption.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. All the State laws have apportioned the road funds to the rural highways and not to the large cities. Some of them go far enough to include villages and cities of 2,000 inhabitants, and there is not a single State law in the United States, among all of the States, that goes so far as to appropriate money for city streets. The reason is that it would not be a fair thing in this bill to provide for city streets. As I say, it is primarily for the rural highway. The cities get many forms of Federal aid, many internal improvements. They get their post-office buildings. The city of Chicago has its fine Federal buildings that cost millions and millions of dollars. And now gentlemen from the cities, or some of them, object to giving the rural communities a little money on a very belated and necessary improvement like the improvement of our wagon roads. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those Representatives from a city who do not object to the country getting a fair proportion of all appropriations, and when this bill was up before I voted for it—

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I know you did.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the statement he made a moment ago, as to how the farmers pay \$50,000,000 in taxes to the United States Government?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They pay their township taxes, and county taxes, and highway taxes, and pay a tremendous tax to your manufacturers. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I respond very promptly by saying that all residents of the city pay an enormous price for the products that come from the gentleman's farm, and the cost of living has gone up very high to consumers in the cities.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. You pay it to your commission merchants, who make as much as the farmer does.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be, and that is a matter for regulation by law. But let the gentleman answer my question as to how it is and where it is that the farmer pays \$50,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I have not said he paid it directly into the Treasury of the United States. How does the State of Pennsylvania pay the amount of money to this Federal road fund?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The State of Pennsylvania has, up to date, paid for its own roads, and so have the New England States.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I asked you the question, Has the State of Pennsylvania paid one cent directly into the United States Treasury except by way of an income tax or something of that kind?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has paid large sums into the United States Treasury in internal taxes and because of the improvement of rivers and harbors it is enabled to collect, and does collect, many millions in the form of customs duties.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Through our good roads we are going to benefit you in Pennsylvania the same as you benefit us. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I admit there may be a mutual benefit. We are interdependent, but my question referred to the farmers' payment of \$50,000,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I did not make any such statement. I said we paid taxes on \$50,000,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmer pays taxes in my State and in the gentleman's State, but not for Federal purposes. He pays taxes only for local purposes.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If the gentleman has supported the bill in the last Congress, he should do so in this Congress, and he will support this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I rose only to request the gentleman to be fair toward the various sections of the country, and not to attack those parts of the country through which the revenues of the country are collected—as to customs duties, one-third of the whole.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am not attacking them. I am simply saying we ought to halt in these other internal improvements until we have made a very necessary and belated improvement in our roads. All the people of the United States have been contributing to the internal improvements, such as rivers and harbors and other works, for a hundred years, and the only United States law or Federal law that was ever passed for roads was passed away back in Jefferson's administration, in which we appropriated \$7,000,000 for the great Cumberland Road; and that money was as well expended as any \$7,000,000 that was ever appropriated by this Government. [Applause.] It opened and started the great western march of the people of this country toward the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman and I agree as to that.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says he knows the city people pay enormous prices for the products of the farmers. Does he know that the Secretary of Agriculture, after a very careful investigation, reports that the farmer gets only approximately 50 per cent of the price paid by the consumer?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman from North Dakota is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The fact remains, however, that we pay enormously high prices in the cities for the products of the farmer. You have nothing on us in that respect.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I repeat, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] is entirely right in regard to the farmer getting only 50 per cent of the real selling price paid by the consumer of the product he raises.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will join the gentleman in attempting to remedy that condition as quickly as any other Member of the House.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Well, the Government is trying to work out that problem now, and I hope it is going to be successful. But it is certainly going to lessen the cost to the consumer when it will save an enormous amount of unnecessary cost in hauling products over bad roads. The Secretary of Agriculture says that in the hauling of the annual crop it really is a loss of something like \$100,000,000 in marketing the annual crop of from \$5,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000, caused by bad roads, and he says that the highest tax which the American people are paying to-day is the bad road or mud tax.

That is what this bill seeks to remedy. We have got over 2,000,000 miles of roads in the United States, and—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Not now. I can not yield.

I say we have over 2,000,000 miles of roads in the United States, and it is an enormous thing to contemplate—the building, in the first instance, the keeping in repair and seeing after the maintenance of all these roads. If the Federal Government appropriates this amount, this is going to act as a great educational factor, as we argued. We have a small Roads Bureau in the United States Government now, but the trouble is that so little money is appropriated for it that it can hardly get out a bulletin or make an investigation. If we appropriate \$25,000,000, that will be but a small thing for a State like Pennsylvania. That State will get something like a million and a half dollars from it. It may be a small thing, but it is going

to educate the people all over the United States as to road building. It is going to educate every State highway commission. The engineers have not yet figured out and gotten up a road that will stand the wear and tear of modern traffic. We are going to have the best engineers in the country working on that problem. In Pennsylvania, if you want macadam roads at \$30,000 a mile, you can have them. If you just want to maintain the roads already built and not build new ones, under this law you can spend the money you receive toward maintaining them. It is a law that is workable in all the 48 States of the Union. You can not make a hard-and-fast rule or specify a kind of road that will be good or a road system that will be workable in all the 48 States, because there are so many different conditions that a road that is good in the interior of Pennsylvania, for example, would bankrupt one of our Western States or agricultural communities.

This bill provides that the moneys shall be apportioned and expended as recommended by the various highway commissions of the States, and it is safeguarded by the Secretary of Agriculture, who stands back there with all the experience and investigation he gets from the engineers and road builders in the different States, and he does not let a dollar go out of the Treasury until he knows that a dollar has been expended by the States, and not only expended, but expended in an intelligent manner. Then only does he let it go. I do not see but that this Government would be amply safeguarded in passing a law of this kind.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is there a provision in this bill that the different States can not participate in this fund unless they contribute a proportionate part?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes. Every State has to pay. When a road proposition is presented by the State highway department to the Secretary of Agriculture, he is the judge of whether the Federal Government pays 30 or 50 per cent of what it can be built for. If it is a high-class road or macadam road, they will get probably 50 per cent. If it is a gravel road or dirt road, it may be 30 per cent. Then the State has got to pay the balance. If the Government gives 50 per cent, the State has got to pay 50 per cent. If the Government pays 30 per cent, the State has got to come forward and pay 70 per cent.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. Is it left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the amount which shall be paid by the Federal Government and the amount which shall be paid by the State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is left to him to determine the per cent, which shall be between 30 and 50 per cent. On an expensive road he will undoubtedly allow a larger per cent than he will on a dirt road or a gravel road; yet in thousands of places in the United States the only road that is practicable and that can be built will be a plain dirt road, well graded and kept up. In some places where they have the material a gravel road will be the kind of road they will build. Right back of all this you have the State highway commission watching over that matter and reporting, and you have the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and his experts to say what kind of a road shall be built and whether a particular road is one that should have Federal aid or not. I think that the money the Government is called upon to appropriate is safeguarded in every way, and that the Government can be sure that the money appropriated by it is going to be used wisely and economically.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman why the committee did not place in this bill a provision appropriating the money so as to vitalize the bill?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Appropriations have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The Roads Committee is not an appropriating committee. We have not the authority to recommend appropriations.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The Roads Committee has no authority to make appropriations, and, of course, this bill will have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DILLON. But Congress can appropriate the money?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. DILLON. Then why does not it do that and vitalize this bill?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If Congress passes this bill, then the question of appropriating the money goes to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DILLON. And that will be the last of it?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What is the attitude of the Department of Agriculture and its Bureau of Public Roads with reference to this bill? Has it considered this bill, and what is its attitude?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am informed that the Department of Agriculture favors this bill. I am also informed that the State highway commissioners of the various States, representing the State highway departments, met and got up a tentative bill that is substantially this bill. It may vary in some particulars, but on the whole it is practically this bill, and I know that a number of the highway commissions have written letters expressing their approval of this bill.

Mr. NORTON. If this bill passes, does it impose any obligation on the Committee on Appropriations to report, in the sundry civil appropriation bill, an appropriation of \$25,000,000 a year, or any amount?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Of course the Committee on Appropriations has got to act on this just the same as on other bills. As the gentleman well knows, the Roads Committee has no power to appropriate any money. The Roads Committee passed on this bill, and if it is the sense of this Congress that this bill should pass, I think there are enough Members who will favor it so that undoubtedly the Committee on Appropriations would recommend the appropriation.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANFORD. Am I to understand from the reading of this bill that there is any provision here that will require the several States before receiving Federal aid to spend any amount of money whatever in the construction of roads? That is, if the members of a community get together and do their share of the work—by convict labor, or by local labor, or in any other manner, if they produce the desired result—do they not become entitled to Federal aid when a certain portion of the road is finished, regardless of whether they have spent any money or not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They have got to present to the Secretary of Agriculture their system of roads.

Mr. SANFORD. They can do it in any way they want to, can they not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They must present their plans and specifications. Then, if they accept the terms imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, they can go back and build their road, and the Secretary of Agriculture does not care how they build it. If they present to him a good road according to plans and specifications and show that it cost so much money, then he turns over to them the amount that the Government has promised. But if they spend more money upon that road than it ought to cost they do not get anything for the excess of cost. They get exactly what that road can be built for if it is built in the most economical way.

Mr. SANFORD. The point I am making is that a State or a community can build their road without spending one dollar, doing it by convict labor, for instance, or local labor.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If they build it by convict labor, that represents so much labor or so much money. If I am riding over a road down in Kentucky, if it is a good road I, as a citizen of the United States, do not care how it has been built, and if the State has put in a dollar's worth of work, and the Government of the United States has put in a dollar, and we have two dollars' worth of road, that is all I care about.

Mr. SANFORD. If we spend \$25,000,000 through the Federal Government, we will give employment to that much labor, as a reward for the local labor of the various communities. Does not that seem reasonable?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They simply hire that work to be done. The convict system of labor is employed in only a few of the States of the Union to work on the roads. We would rather have convicts work on the roads than to have them work in competition with free labor in other directions.

Mr. SANFORD. I do not mean convict labor particularly. I mean that so long as the work is done by the State, the Government does not care how it is done.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If they hire local labor and pay for it, they will have to spend that much money to do the work, and I should not think it would make any difference to the gentleman from New York whether the State as a unit

appropriated the money or whether the different localities appropriated the money. We want a law that will be workable in all the States of the Union. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in somewhat a lonely minority on my committee in opposing this measure, because I believe it is an unwise policy for the Federal Government to undertake. After reading the speeches in the debates in the last Congress and listening to statements made by the honorable chairman of the committee and my associate who has just concluded, members of the Roads Committee, I am convinced that the only thing the Federal-aid road bill will not accomplish is the cure of measles and the eradication of the seven-year locusts. [Laughter.]

You would think to hear the statements made by gentlemen on the floor of this Chamber at the last session that if you can get Federal aid for highways all the evils in many communities of our several States are to be wiped out. I say that it is an unwise policy for this Government to undertake this thing at this particular time.

The chairman of the committee said that good roads have become a burning question in many of the Western States. Ah, yes, Mr. Chairman, a burning question, but not so burning that they are willing to appropriate their own money to build their roads and maintain their highways. He says there is a great public demand for this measure. Of course, Mr. Chairman, there is always a great public demand whenever there is an opportunity for communities or States to reach into the Federal Treasury and extract funds therefrom.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to inquire whether there is a road in the United States except the Cumberland highway that was not constructed by the farmers and the ordinary laborers and the people in the States without Federal aid?

Mr. WALSH. That is true, Mr. Chairman, but I say that these many States throughout this country can well afford to build their own roads, that it is no part of the Federal Government's duty or obligation to construct highways in whole or in part for the States. One of the bad features of this bill is that the very States that have expended millions of dollars in the construction of their own highways will be called upon to contribute heavily for the construction of roads in other sections of the country. Take the States of Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, yes Kansas and California, where they have modern highways, and you will find that in computing the proportion of direct taxes—and it will be by direct taxes that this appropriation will be made up—they pay a large proportion of the amount.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman says that the money that will go to pay these expenses will be raised by direct taxation. What does the gentleman mean; how does he mean to differentiate these taxes?

Mr. WALSH. I mean that the revenue of this country secured under the present tariff law is insufficient to carry on the functions of the various departments of this Government, and this administration has been forced to levy a war tax to help pay the expenses of the Government. If you add \$25,000,000 more to the expenses of the Government, necessarily it must come out of the direct taxes which have been levied.

Mr. BLACK. But how does the gentleman know that this particular fund will come out of the direct taxes?

Mr. WALSH. What difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, whether it comes out directly or indirectly, you will levy the tax and the people will have to pay it. I point out to the gentleman in this connection that of the \$52,000,000 secured by these special taxes during the year ending June 30, 1915, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania paid \$31,140,000.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for another question? Does the gentleman think that ought to be the criterion for public expenses—what a single State pays into the Treasury?

Mr. WALSH. I think when you are embarking on a policy entirely new, a plan entirely novel, to take up a matter which has heretofore been handled by the States independently of the Federal Government, that that certainly should be taken into account, and the further fact that the several States have expended millions of dollars improving their highways also should be taken into account when other States which have expended comparatively small sums for this purpose are asking for a contribution for internal improvements, such as is contemplated by this proposed measure.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. KELLEY. Does not the gentleman think the subject of transportation, whether on the railroads or on the rivers or on the highways, ought to be treated as a whole? In other words, practically all of the merchandise that is hauled over the railroads must be hauled over the highways, and if it is proper to assist in building railroads to a large extent all over the country as we have in times past, why is it not proper to assist in the development of highways which lead up to the stations? [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. In answer to that, I do not think it is proper, because there is no analogy between the two situations.

Mr. KELLEY. Why not? It seems to me that there is. Will the gentleman state in what particular the analogy fails.

Mr. WALSH. In this particular, because this bill is not confined to any particular road used in interstate commerce or in roads running from railroads to any particular point. Any little cow path or lane or alley, in so far as it may be outside the limits of any city, incorporated village or town, can receive Federal aid under this bill. It is not to be directed to thoroughfares from one State into another, but any little road, if it starts nowhere and goes elsewhere, can receive aid.

Mr. KELLEY. To make my question clear, if it is proper for the Federal Government to assist in building a road to carry produce over a road from city to city, why is it not proper for the Federal Government to assist in constructing a road from the farm to the station?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have not as yet admitted that it is proper for the Federal Government to construct a road from the farm to the city or from the city to the farm, nor to aid in the construction of railroads in the States.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman think that if the appropriation is once made out of the Federal Treasury for the construction of highways it will absolutely paralyze all local movement, and that no community will ever thereafter be willing to do anything for itself.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the thoughts which I had in mind when I undertook here in my place to defend my position in submitting this report. I intended to express that thought, but I have been diverted by these many interruptions.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if I may answer the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The answer is found on page 3 of the bill in the provision that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the construction of a road has been finished he shall then pay the Government contribution, so that the State can not get any of the Government money until after it has complied with that provision and paid out the State money.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied the gentleman from Massachusetts can answer that question.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must decline to yield at the present time. I would like to get along with my remarks. Possibly later when the opportunity offers I will be glad to withstand the bombardment of questions from these gentlemen who are so anxious and willing to admit that their own States have failed miserably in the duty which was laid upon them when their States were formed, to construct their own highways, as many States have done.

Take the great State of New York, for example. That State has expended millions and millions of dollars in constructing a modern system of highways, and would contribute several millions of dollars toward this appropriation, but it would receive back from its own contribution only a small amount, a little over \$1,000,000, as its allotment under this bill, and yet it is contended that this distribution is equitable. Mr. Chairman, I believe the reason why the arbitrary amount of \$65,000 was fixed in the bill is simply as the darky would say, to take the "cuss" off the whole proposition; and if it were not for that \$65,000, Delaware would receive only \$38,000, under the bill as drawn; Nevada, \$36,000; Rhode Island, \$74,000; Utah, \$73,000; Wyoming, \$60,000; Arizona, \$52,000; Idaho, \$105,000; and Vermont, \$122,000.

Let me call your attention to the definition of what a rural post roads is, as contained in this bill. It is stated that the term "rural post roads"—

shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried—

Mr. Chairman, I ask some one to point out a single highway in the whole Union that can not be considered a rural post road

under that definition, because the mail might be carried over it at some time. The bill continues:

Outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in such cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Mr. Chairman, they actually seek in this bill to set that up as a definition of a rural post road, which is to cover the appropriation of Federal funds in the construction of highways throughout these United States. I say it is defective, and the committee could very well have said that they will appropriate money simply for the aid of highways in the several States of the Union. Another feature of this measure which I submit is vicious in its import is that the Congress of the United States says to the several States of the Union: You have got to have a certain department in running your own affairs; you must necessarily have a highway commission within your borders, irrespective of whether the people of your State desire a highway commission or a highway department; if you want Federal aid you have got to establish one, and it has got to be called presumably by that name and under that designation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, another defect in the bill is that once having appropriated money, and that money having been expended, the Government has no further supervision over the highways. The Government gives the State this money, and after the road is constructed and the money is paid the Government retains no jurisdiction or control over the highway, and that highway the very next year, for all that Congress knows, may be discontinued or abandoned or used in some other way or for some other purpose, so that the money that the Congress has appropriated and expended for this purpose will have become wasted.

If this is a wise policy to adopt, there should have been some provision for the control or supervision in the future. In my opinion, appropriating the money to aid in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads is a shallow pretext, because the concluding section of the bill makes it clear that it is done simply to aid the farmers of the country; and, in so far as that is true, this is class legislation. I am not criticizing the farmers of the country, because we have farmers in the New England States—in "effete" New England, as it was termed here the other day—and the farmers in the New England States have been in the past and will be in the future ready and willing to assume and bear their burdens by way of increased taxes and build their own roads from their farms to the railroad stations or from their farms to the post offices—and under this bill no allowance is made for what they have done in this direction heretofore—but to seek to appropriate money on the pretext that you are doing it to aid rural free delivery or to improve rural post roads, in view of the words in the next to the last section of the bill, shows conclusively that it is not done to aid in the delivery of the United States mails or to build up a great system of highways for the great Postal Service of the country, but is done to relieve a certain class of our population in certain sections of our vast country of burdens which in other sections of the country have been patiently, if not cheerfully, borne by individuals of the same class. And I say it is to the glory and credit of the New England farmer, and the farmers of other States where large sums of money have been expended, that they have borne this burden in the shape of taxation, and have, in addition, contributed their just share of taxation for other improvements, local, State, and national, without a whimper. The Massachusetts farmers, in common with the farmers of other New England States and the farmers of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, and California are no weaklings, Mr. Chairman, and they are reaping the benefits of expenditures to which they have contributed without a thought of a partnership between their State and the Federal Government.

But if it is done to relieve the farmer of the burdens which they ought to be willing to bear, if there is this great demand, and if it is going to lift these great burdens from the farmers, and it is going to result in this tremendous financial benefit to them, why should they not be willing in the States of the West or the States of the South or the States or any other section of the country to bear the burden of increased taxation and have the roads built under State supervision? The advocates of this measure talk about the State appropriating half the money. Why, Mr. Chairman, if they are willing to appropriate half the money, if the Government should put in half, why are not these States willing to appropriate their half at once or in the near future without Federal aid and show to the country at large that they have made an honest effort, a conscientious endeavor, to remedy a defect which has existed owing to the lack of a modern system of highways in their respective communities? We have proceeded in this country here-

tofore, as I before stated, with the building of roads as a matter of State duty and State jurisdiction, and we would be as well justified in appropriating money here in this Congress to build schoolhouses or town halls and to take care of the paupers of the many States of this Union as we would be to step in and appropriate money to build these roads. If this is to become a law, I submit that if those States are sincere in their effort to have improved highways there should be some provision inserted in this bill whereby the States which receive this money shall repay at least a part of it back to the Federal Treasury.

I have pointed out in my minority views printed to accompany the report on this bill, Mr. Chairman, some of the inconsistencies and discrepancies which occur in the apportionment of the money under the provisions of this bill, and I want to call attention to the fact that, although this bill is supposed to improve roads in rural communities, no allowance is made in computing the population. No allowance is made for the population in the great cities of these various States. They are all included in the total of population and in the ratio which the population of that State bears to the population of the entire country. But if this is to aid the rural communities, the population should be apportioned upon the ratio which the rural population bears to the population of the entire country, so that this money will go to those communities where the need may be expressed as great. For instance, Colorado, with a population of nearly 800,000, is allowed \$252,000; Oregon, with 672,000 population, gets \$248,000; North and South Dakota, with a population combined of less than 600,000, get \$335,000 and \$337,000, respectively—

Mr. DILON. That is not right.

Mr. WALSH. While Connecticut, with over 1,000,000 of population, is allowed but \$258,000. The mileage comparison is the same and the same discrepancies occur; and in the star-route mileage, as set forth in this bill here, in the table accompanying the report, the same discrepancies occur. Rhode Island, with 87.61 miles of star routes, gets \$139,000. Wyoming, with 4,137 miles of star-route highways, only gets \$125,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, at least some effort should be made in appropriating Federal money to see that it goes to States which at least try to improve their own system of highways. In 1913 the State of Alabama, as a State, for State highways, spent \$127,000, and under this allotment here she would be allowed to receive \$579,000. Delaware spent \$30,000, and is allotted under this bill \$103,000. California spent \$2,000,000 and over in 1913, and yet she gets but \$504,000. Connecticut spent \$3,483,000, and she gets but \$258,000. Florida and Georgia spent not a cent, as States, for highways in 1913, and yet get \$202,000 for Florida and \$722,000 for Georgia.

The following States made no expenditures for State highway funds in 1913: Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. The total amount of State expenditures for highways in 1913, Mr. Chairman, in the United States only amounted to \$37,437,000, and of this amount the States of California, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and even Washington, in the far Northwest, contributed of that \$37,000,000 the sum of \$30,000,000. So you can see the many States that have neglected the road problem. Of course they can say that there has been a great increase in highway commissions and highway departments in some of these Western States, but it is interesting to notice that this increase in these highway commissions has been coincident with the introduction of Federal-aid road bills in the Congress of the United States. I say it is because these highway commissions have sought to expend or to assist in the expenditure of Federal aid.

Now, Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the Government having the constitutional authority to expend money for post offices and post roads. That may or may not be true. There may or may not be some doubt upon that question, but irrespective of that, whenever the United States Government undertakes to expend money for improvements they see to it that in expending that money that it is wisely and judiciously expended; and furthermore, they exercise, after the expenditure is made, some degree of control, and that is not the case with this law.

They say that because the United States uses these highways and byways in carrying the rural mail to the patrons of the country post offices that they should therefore aid to the extent of one-half of the expense in constructing and repairing those roads. I say, sir, that if this bill and its purpose is to be based upon the theory that because the Government uses the highways it should therefore contribute to the maintenance and constructing of them, that then the Government should only contribute its fair share toward maintaining and constructing these highways,

taking into account all the uses to which the highways are put; and if that were the theory upon which this legislation were to stand you would find, instead of paying from 30 to 50 per cent of the cost, that this Government would only pay from 1 to 10 per cent of the cost, and no such large sum would be required to be appropriated.

I say, sir, that to enact this legislation will discourage rather than encourage road building under State auspices, because once you get Federal expenditure or Federal appropriation or Federal participation in carrying out any of the great functions of the Government the growth and tendency of the times have been to discourage doing or performing that function under State auspices and to gradually and slowly turn that power, authority, or duty over to Federal supervision and control. And I say that under this bill that will inevitably follow. There may not be men here who will see it, but there will come a time if we launch the Government upon this program when the States will take the stand that if their highways become run down and out of repair that because the United States Government at one time expended money for the construction or maintenance of those roads they will not do anything more for them until the United States Government comes to their rescue.

I say, sir, that this legislation is not wise, and I want to call the attention of the gentlemen on this side of the House especially to the fact that this is one of the measures which for several years has been in the platform of the Democratic Party, while the Republican Party has never incorporated a plank for Federal aid, but has simply asserted its belief in good roads and recommended the improvement of them to the several States of the Union. And I am not surprised at the frantic endeavors of the Democracy to fulfill their platform promise in this respect, because it is in striking contrast with their efforts in the past to put into practice their promises upon one or two other doctrines laid down in that immortal document, and I might refer perhaps to the one-term plank as to the presidential term of office.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I say, sir, that it is well for this Congress at this time to stop and consider whether, in view of the many

important questions that are pressing for consideration, whether in view of the present condition of the Federal Treasury as it has been enunciated upon both sides of this Chamber, this country is in a condition to launch out upon an entirely new policy involving an expenditure of \$25,000,000. But if it is well to set forth upon this unknown sea, I submit it would be much better for this House to reduce that appropriation materially—down to less than \$5,000,000—and see what will happen with that kind of an appropriation and the consequent apportionment that could be made thereunder. But I object, because I honestly and sincerely believe that this is not a policy for which we as Members of this great body ought to stand under the present conditions in this country, and in view of the fact that the sole demand, as it were, seems to come from States which in the past have been unwilling to aid themselves and now see a chance to have Federal aid from the United States Treasury. [Applause.]

I desire to submit the following comparative tables and invite the attention of the proponents of the measure to them:

Comparisons.

MILEAGE COMPARISONS.

Louisiana, with 0.75 per cent of combined routes, gets.....	\$345,064
West Virginia, with 1.19 per cent of combined routes, gets.....	340,688
Montana, with 0.76 per cent of combined routes, gets.....	192,998

RURAL FREE DELIVERY MILEAGE.

Alabama, 25,845 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	579,180
Kentucky, 18,765 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	580,274
New Jersey, 7,149 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	438,054
Vermont, 7,610 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	187,528

STAR-ROUTE MILEAGE.

Illinois, 717.77 miles, gets.....	1,372,330
Montana, 6,541 miles, gets.....	792,998
Rhode Island, 87.61 miles, gets.....	139,392
Wyoming, 4,137.03 miles, gets.....	125,170
Connecticut, 4,724 miles, gets.....	253,168
Delaware, 359.06 miles, gets.....	258,638

Yet Pennsylvania, with 8.36 per cent of population and 4.48 per cent of rural free delivery and star routes, and receiving \$1,469,696, is given \$65,000, the same as the smaller States; also New York, with 9,113,614 population, 9.94 per cent, and 4.04 per cent of combined routes, receiving \$1,372,330, receives \$65,000, the same as Nevada and other small States.

TABLE 1.—State highway expenditures to Jan. 1, 1915.
[Prepared by U. S. Department of Agriculture.]

State.	Year original State-aid law passed.	Expenditures in 1914.							Total State money expended for road work from outset to Jan. 1, 1915.	State money available for road work, 1915.	
		Local funds expended in road work by counties, townships, and districts.	Joint funds (State and local units).			Road work done solely at expense of State.	Total of all State money expended for road work.	Total of State funds and joint funds.			Total of State funds, joint funds, and local funds.
			Local unit's share.	State's share.	Total joint fund.						
Alabama.....	1911	\$2,795,000	\$160,693	\$170,232	\$330,925		\$168,232	\$330,925	\$3,125,925	\$460,271	\$144,000
Arizona.....	1909	603,608				\$406,125	406,125	406,125	1,009,733	563,210	396,883
Arkansas.....	1913	2,332,368		115,000	115,000		115,000	115,000	2,447,368	140,000	25,000
California.....	1895	9,495,281				5,175,333	5,175,333	5,175,333	14,670,614	8,209,942	7,000,000
Colorado.....	1909	1,621,850	678,225	301,274	979,499		301,274	979,499	2,601,449	821,751	85,000
Connecticut.....	1895	1,400,000	265,125	1,307,381	1,672,506	2,124,276	3,431,657	3,696,782	5,996,782	14,934,176	1,000,000
Delaware.....	1903	360,411	30,000	31,000	61,000		31,000	61,000	421,411	193,695	36,000
Florida.....	1915	3,450,000							3,450,000		
Georgia.....	1908	2,500,000							2,500,000		
Idaho.....	1905	1,265,000	43,466	49,812	93,278		49,812	93,278	1,358,278	372,812	209,000
Illinois.....	1905	7,102,977	446,702	387,989	\$34,691		387,989	\$34,691	7,937,668	867,989	2,190,000
Indiana.....		13,258,761							13,258,761		
Iowa.....	1904	11,363,000		74,000	74,000		74,000	74,000	11,437,000	175,000	100,000
Kansas.....	1911	5,427,424		9,080	9,080		9,080	9,080	5,436,504	20,000	11,000
Kentucky.....	1912	1,700,000		18,000	18,000		18,000	18,000	1,718,000	43,000	600,000
Louisiana.....	1910	4,000,000	300,320	161,186	461,506		161,186	461,506	4,461,506	145,000	145,000
Maine.....	1901	1,863,000	375,731	467,149	\$42,880	831,716	1,298,965	1,674,596	3,537,596	4,855,864	1,090,000
Maryland.....	1898	2,000,000	256,845	356,845	713,690	4,283,768	4,640,613	4,997,458	6,997,458	14,253,142	4,572,000
Massachusetts.....	1892	3,318,742	241,838	242,560	484,398	2,217,469	2,460,029	2,701,867	6,020,609	10,365,425	2,437,000
Michigan.....	1905	6,715,000	2,082,612	657,264	2,739,876	61,348	718,612	2,801,224	9,516,224	2,207,701	1,700,000
Minnesota.....	1905	4,272,244	2,643,621	1,309,956	3,953,577		1,309,956	3,953,577	8,225,821	2,708,174	1,770,742
Mississippi.....		2,850,000							2,850,000		
Missouri.....	1907	8,000,000		277,253	277,253		277,253	277,253	8,277,253	1,421,983	350,000
Montana.....	1913	2,553,773		13,516	13,516		13,516		2,567,289	16,000	25,000
Nebraska.....	1911	3,347,062					36,783		3,347,062	257,850	106,000
Nevada.....	1911	240,000							240,000		
New Hampshire.....	1903	1,250,000	301,288	491,520	792,808	9,365	500,885	802,173	2,052,173	2,593,450	400,000
New Jersey.....	1891	3,000,000	2,235,976	1,306,596	3,542,572		1,306,596	3,542,572	6,542,572	2,192,268	1,300,000
New Mexico.....	1909	371,196	40,281	115,732	156,013		115,732	156,013	527,209	510,833	175,000
New York.....	1898	7,741,142	6,655,072	8,544,126	15,199,198	6,950,133	15,494,259	22,149,331	29,890,473	82,638,729	15,000,000
North Carolina.....	1901	3,930,000		5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	3,935,000	28,500	10,000
North Dakota.....	1909	2,365,000							2,365,000		

¹ Data approximate.

² Includes \$2,000 paid to county for bridges, but not reported as expended.

³ Data for fiscal year.

⁴ July 1, 1912, to Jan. 1, 1915.

⁵ No money aid for construction.

⁶ Data includes the State expenditure of \$150,920 on 519 miles of State mountain roads, divided as follows: Construction, \$54,866; maintenance, \$89,713; engineering, \$2,844; and administration, \$3,446.

⁷ Data from State comptroller's report.

⁸ State highway department provided for beginning Oct. 1, 1915.

⁹ State aid in road construction beginning 1915.

¹⁰ Data from the State auditor's report.

¹¹ State aid in bridge construction only.

TABLE 1.—State highway expenditures to Jan. 1, 1915—Continued.

State.	Year original State-aid law passed.	Expenditures in 1914.								Total State money expended for road work from outset to Jan. 1, 1915.	State money available for road work, 1915.
		Local funds expended in road work by counties, townships, and districts.	Joint funds (State and local units).			Road work done solely at expense of State.	Total of all State money expended for road work.	Total of State funds and joint funds.	Total of State funds, joint funds, and local funds.		
			Local unit's share.	State's share.	Total joint fund.						
Ohio.....	1904	\$8,500,000	\$906,543	\$1,855,338	\$2,761,882	\$1,855,338	\$2,761,882	\$11,261,882	\$5,123,671	\$3,300,000
Oklahoma ²	1911	3,375,000	10,000	3,375,000	20,323	15,000
Oregon.....	1913	5,155,657	1,718,000	10,697	1,728,697	\$178,278	188,975	1,906,975	7,062,632	188,975	233,000
Pennsylvania.....	1903	5,500,091	657,437	1,976,768	2,634,205	2,290,284	³ 4,354,666	4,924,489	10,424,580	24,259,954	5,000,000
Rhode Island.....	1902	385,000	199,598	199,598	199,598	584,598	3,703,065	180,000
South Carolina.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
South Dakota.....	1911	1,421,501	1,421,501
Tennessee ⁴	1915	2,500,000	2,500,000
Texas.....	18,750,000	8,750,000
Utah ⁵	1909	1,750,000	249,204	157,732	406,936	157,732	406,936	1,156,936	688,732	100,000
Vermont.....	1898	723,011	300,000	458,456	758,456	458,456	758,456	1,481,467	3,186,419	400,000
Virginia.....	1906	2,148,436	1,243,432	523,578	1,767,010	523,578	1,767,010	3,915,446	2,186,895	520,000
Washington ⁶	1905	14,000,000	1,343,431	1,343,431	877,700	2,221,131	2,221,131	6,221,131	7,117,769	2,167,583
West Virginia ⁷	1909	2,388,000	144,000	144,000	3,766	144,000	2,532,000	⁷ 121,766	11,800
Wisconsin.....	1911	4,519,000	3,117,329	1,482,379	4,599,708	1,482,379	4,599,708	9,118,708	2,829,486	1,215,000
Wyoming.....	1911	426,448	6,237	426,448	38,237	5,000
Total.....		174,035,083	25,193,740	24,220,850	49,414,591	25,605,393	49,968,643	75,019,984	249,055,067	211,859,163	54,884,000

¹ Data approximate.² Educational and advisory.³ Includes \$87,714 for surveys and plotting State routes, county road maps, etc., not classed among items given.⁴ State highway department provided for by act of legislature, 1915.⁵ Data from State comptroller's report.⁶ Figures given are one-half of the expenditures for the period Apr. 1, 1913, to Apr. 1, 1915.⁷ Of this, \$118,090 was returned to counties in 1911 by act of legislature.

TABLE 2.—Distribution of expenditures under State control for the year 1914.

State.	Expenditure of joint funds of State and local units.					Work done under State control or inspection.				Expenditure of State funds for work done solely at expense of State.						
	Contribution from State funds					Contribution from local funds.				Construction roads and bridges.	Maintenance.	Engineering and inspection.	Administration.	Miscellaneous equipment.	Total State expense.	
	Construction roads and bridges.	Maintenance.	Engineering and inspection.	Administration.	Miscellaneous equipment, etc.	Total from State.	Construction.	Maintenance.	Total from local units.							
Alabama.....	¹ \$160,412	\$320	(²)	\$8,200	\$1,300	\$170,232	\$100,693	\$160,693	\$301,173	\$14,670	\$14,569	\$19,161	\$56,552	\$406,125	
Arizona.....	
Arkansas.....	
California.....	
Colorado.....	285,851	(³)	13,501	1,922	301,274	609,863	678,225	4,630,895	142,697	137,177	174,699	89,865	5,175,333	
Connecticut.....	1,307,381	(⁴)	1,307,381	265,125	265,125	1,015,536	925,332	135,774	47,634	2,124,276	
Delaware.....	30,000	1,000	31,000	30,000	30,000	
Florida ⁵	
Georgia ⁶	
Idaho.....	21,733	21,713	6,366	49,812	43,466	43,466	
Illinois.....	281,702	(⁷)	51,735	54,532	387,969	446,702	446,702	
Indiana ⁸	
Iowa ⁹	50,000	10,000	14,000	74,000	
Kansas ¹⁰	8,130	950	9,080	
Kentucky.....	9,000	6,000	3,000	18,000	
Louisiana.....	123,962	487	21,855	13,208	1,674	161,186	298,859	1,461	300,320	688,355	43,400	42,649	57,812	831,716	
Maine.....	375,452	60,246	31,451	467,149	338,016	37,715	375,731	3,768,037	341,877	131,699	30,326	11,839	4,283,768	
Maryland.....	356,845	356,845	356,845	356,845	1,125,512	805,723	175,343	50,986	59,905	2,217,469	
Massachusetts.....	242,560	242,560	241,838	241,838	61,348	61,348	
Michigan.....	590,716	13,035	36,167	11,808	5,538	657,264	2,032,612	50,000	2,082,612	
Minnesota.....	963,547	202,624	131,601	12,184	1,309,956	2,523,134	120,487	2,643,621	
Mississippi ¹¹	
Missouri.....	175,885	93,802	7,566	277,253	
Montana ¹²	850	7,542	13,516	
Nebraska ¹³	
Nevada ¹⁴	
New Hampshire.....	271,767	157,155	11,995	50,603	491,520	225,000	76,288	301,288	9,365	9,365	
New Jersey.....	558,027	679,969	18,600	50,000	1,306,596	770,715	1,465,261	2,235,976	
New Mexico.....	115,732	115,732	40,281	40,281	
New York.....	3,358,625	¹⁵ 185,501	8,544,126	3,239,473	3,415,599	6,655,072	5,258,833	28,000	¹⁶ 1,230,254	¹⁷ 907,520	125,526	6,950,133	
North Carolina ¹⁸	3,000	1,250	750	5,000	
North Dakota ¹⁹	
Ohio.....	1,363,975	232,890	108,907	83,139	66,427	1,855,338	906,543	906,543	
Oklahoma ²⁰	
Oregon.....	10,697	10,697	1,718,000	1,718,000	161,475	16,803	178,278	
Pennsylvania.....	²¹ 1,542,323	343,726	90,719	1,976,768	657,437	657,437	²² 574,312	1,344,780	45,925	266,206	59,061	2,290,284	
Rhode Island.....	28,440	146,807	19,351	5,000	199,598	
South Carolina ²³	
South Dakota ²⁴	
Tennessee ²⁵	
Texas ²⁶	
Utah.....	120,809	(²⁷)	6,750	30,173	157,732	249,204	249,204	
Vermont.....	318,456	140,000	458,456	120,000	180,000	300,000	
Virginia.....	²⁸ 474,684	48,894	(²⁹)	523,578	1,243,432	1,243,432	
Washington.....	³⁰ 1,300,514	42,917	1,343,431	733,779	25,691	75,927	32,859	9,444	877,700	
West Virginia ³¹	144,000	144,000	
Wisconsin.....	1,395,379	(³²)	87,000	1,482,379	3,117,329	3,117,329	
Wyoming ³³	
Total.....	15,744,835	7,152,672	605,887	351,827	363,431	24,220,850	19,778,567	5,415,173	25,193,740	18,357,060	3,775,577	2,009,409	993,843	469,504	25,605,393	

¹ Includes \$2,000 paid to county for bridges, but not reported as expended.² Engineering included in administration.³ Engineering paid by counties.⁴ Included in trunk-line maintenance.⁵ Town pays one-fourth of maintenance on State aid.⁶ No State highway department, 1914.⁷ Convict labor to counties.⁸ No State highway department.⁹ Supervisory.¹⁰ Educational and advisory.¹¹ State aid in bridge construction only.¹² Maintenance of State convict road camps.¹³ Of this, \$1,816,119 was for State aid to towns.¹⁴ Engineering and administration expenditures include all State-aid work.¹⁵ Includes \$200,000 bonus to townships.¹⁶ Includes \$73,393 for purchase of toll roads.¹⁷ Engineering included in cost of construction.¹⁸ Administration included in engineering.¹⁹ Permanent highways.

TABLE 3.—State highway mileage, Jan. 1, 1915.

State.	Total all surfaced roads in State (approximate).	Total all public roads in State.	Per centage of surfaced roads in State.	State and State-aid roads built in 1914.	Total all State and State-aid roads built to Jan. 1, 1915.	Roads maintained with State aid, 1914.
	Miles.	Miles.	Per ct.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Alabama.....	5,491	49,639	11.1	1113	399	
Arizona.....	400	2,597	6.7	210	247	122
Arkansas.....	1,085	36,445	3.0	(9)		
California.....	9,388	48,069	19.5	406	1,124	919
Colorado.....	655	30,571	2.1	248	655	
Connecticut.....	3,300	12,582	26.2	199	1,282	1,125
Delaware.....	241	3,000	8.0	10	144	
Florida.....	2,625	17,954	14.6	(9)		
Georgia.....	12,500	83,986	14.9	(9)		
Idaho.....	611	18,406	3.3	70	100	
Illinois.....	9,000	94,141	9.6	99	284	
Indiana.....	26,831	63,370	42.3	(10)		
Iowa.....	2,505	104,027	2.4	(11)		
Kansas.....	1,170	111,536	1.0	(12)		
Kentucky.....	10,636	58,000	18.3	(13)		
Louisiana.....	697	24,962	2.8	75	299	38
Maine.....	3,264	25,528	12.8	260	1,323	648
Maryland.....	2,706	17,025	15.9	330	978	787
Massachusetts.....	8,928	17,272	51.7	184	1,113	967
Michigan.....	8,859	68,906	12.8	694	2,437	1,754
Minnesota.....	16,206	91,890	6.8	305	4,242	8,364
Mississippi.....	1,800	44,072	4.1	(16)		
Missouri.....	8,000	120,000	6.6	(16)		6,250
Montana.....	100	23,319	0.4	(17)		
Nebraska.....	250	80,338	0.3	(17)		
Nevada.....	65	12,751	0.5	(18)		
New Hampshire.....	1,025	15,116	6.8	149	1,024	875
New Jersey.....	4,500	14,842	30.3	102	1,935	2,000
New Mexico.....	900	16,920	5.3	50	357	
New York.....	22,398	80,112	27.9	863	5,167	4,000
North Carolina.....	6,166	49,802	12.4	(19)		
North Dakota.....	200	61,593	0.3	(19)		
Ohio.....	28,312	83,681	33.8	151	569	340
Oklahoma.....	500	71,325	0.7			
Oregon.....	3,994	42,990	9.3	125	309	
Pennsylvania.....	2,976	87,387	4.5	360	1,889	6,882
Rhode Island.....	1,246	2,121	58.8	2	325	325
South Carolina.....	4,888	45,549	17.3	(20)		
South Dakota.....	290	56,354	0.5	(20)		
Tennessee.....	5,554	45,913	12.1	(21)		
Texas.....	9,780	128,971	7.6	(21)		
Utah.....	1,653	7,970	20.7	66	1,072	
Vermont.....	3,278	15,082	22.7	200	1,631	4,252
Virginia.....	4,482	43,399	10.3	751	2,916	
Washington.....	4,250	37,000	11.5	288	1,024	340
West Virginia.....	825	31,629	2.6	(22)		
Wisconsin.....	11,500	61,090	18.8	995	2,632	
Wyoming.....	450	10,569	4.3	(23)		
Total.....	247,490	2,273,131	10.9	6,805	35,477	39,988

¹ Also 59 miles of road graded, but not surfaced.

² Data approximate.

³ Also 77 miles of road graded, but not surfaced.

⁴ No money aid for construction.

⁵ In addition, 2,823 miles of earth road were graded.

⁶ Does not include 3,600 miles of grading.

⁷ Includes reconstruction, 33 miles.

⁸ No State highway department in 1914.

⁹ Convict labor aid to counties.

¹⁰ No State highway department.

¹¹ Supervisory.

¹² Educational and advisory.

¹³ State aid begins 1915.

¹⁴ Includes 83 miles of small town construction.

¹⁵ State roads only.

¹⁶ Also 3,700 miles of graded road.

¹⁷ Also 1,104 miles of grading and turnpiking.

¹⁸ Mileage not reported.

¹⁹ State aid in bridge construction only.

²⁰ Maintenance of State convict road camps.

²¹ Also 198 miles of graded road.

²² In addition, 844 miles of town and county roads.

²³ State and county highways only.

²⁴ Also 314 miles of earth roads.

²⁵ Also 104 miles of earth road graded.

²⁶ Also 602 miles of grading.

Comparisons.

Arizona, 240,354 population, is allotted.....	\$117,512
Nevada, 81,875 population, is allotted.....	101,102
Wyoming, 145,965 population, is allotted.....	125,170
New Hampshire, 403,572 population, is allotted.....	175,494
Same with States of larger population—	
Kansas, 1,690,949 population, is allotted.....	\$747,656
Louisiana, 1,656,388 population, is allotted.....	345,064
Massachusetts, 2,366,416 population, is allotted.....	535,420
Missouri, 3,293,335 population, is allotted.....	974,115

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAUNDERS, Mr. BORLAND, and Mr. HELGESEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Dakota rise?

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that he would answer questions if he had time, and he now has the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has yielded the floor.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, my Republican colleague on the Roads Committee, who lives in a great city and, of course, opposes our bill, is careless when he refers to our rural mail routes as "cow trails." If he will go to the real rural sections of the South and call our cherished rural routes "cow trails," his next trip will be up a telephone pole. His speech of an hour makes it clear that no further argument is needed to convince the majority of this House that this road legislation is equitable, beneficial, and desirable at this time.

There is no conflict between the city and the country as the gentleman from Massachusetts has discussed for an hour. Whatever helps the one upbuilds the other. The city and the country are the thoroughbreds of the future, who are to go hand in hand down the ages in patriotic service to our common country. [Applause.] All thinking men know that prosperity to the country brings wealth and success to the city. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in no other way can our Government add so rapidly to the prosperity of the Nation than by contributing to road building, thus saving millions in transportation and making our sparsely settled sections so desirable that the inhabitants will not wish to leave them. If it is wise and beneficial for the State to raise a general fund, as does the State of Louisiana, out of which a portion of the cost of constructing our roads is to be paid, it would seem equally just and equitable for the Federal Government to contribute a portion toward the cost of constructing highways in each and every State. It is a fundamental principle of democratic government that for the common good and in their own interest the strong sections shall contribute their just part in upbuilding the weak. It is a fact that nearly all large appropriations made by the Federal Government in the past have been expended in and near great cities, while but little, and generally nothing, has been expended in our rural sections. The time has come to right this wrong. In the past for their taxes our farmers have received from the Federal Government a few garden seed, a limited number of rural mail routes, and an occasional promise, not yet fulfilled by the Government. This bill, providing that the Federal Government shall pay not less than 30 per cent nor more than 50 per cent of road construction and road maintenance, is the first direct proposition to give the farmers of the country a square deal. [Applause.]

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people. On the other hand, it should be noted that no system of permanent highways was ever built or maintained in any country without the substantial aid of the general government of that country.

To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities, it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system. In such case it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses.

In times past when the volume and weight of postal matter were negligible the interest of the General Government in the conditions of the roads was not substantial, but with the advent of rural free delivery came a Federal necessity for better roads, and with the now rapidly expanding parcel post that necessity has become acute. The demand upon the Federal Government as expressed by this bill is immediate and imperative, not only for the performance of its functions in the mail service, but to prepare a virile and aggressive citizenship upon which the Government must depend for prosperity and supremacy.

Our great rural population produces the wealth that makes our cities great and perpetuates the power of the Federal Government. They bear the burden of the Government in times of peace, and in times of war the country boy and the boy from the smaller town fearlessly follow the flag where "thickest falls the red rain of human slaughter." He receives little of the blessings of Government beyond the post office and the rural carrier, but in times of need he forgets all this and gives himself freely, if need be, in the cause of his country. [Applause.] This bill is for him. You are for him. The Nation should be for him, for the Government depends upon him. The speedy passage of this bill is but a feeble expression of the gratitude due

him. Then, surely, road building and road maintenance by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is just, equitable, and beneficial, not only as an economic and social necessity but as one of the highest forms of preparedness that will bring needed wealth to the Government in its hours of possible distress. Germany began her marvelous plan of preparedness by building permanent roads and factories and establishing farm credits and scientific agriculture, thus making her citizens efficient and sufficient as a national asset. [Applause.]

Unless we provide for internal improvements as a basis of our national prosperity, upon what shall the additional taxes be levied to meet the emergency for a proposed larger Army and Navy? A nation impoverished within can not be a world power. In this emergency, I for one shall insist that the increased revenue for the Army and Navy come from a Federal inheritance tax and a larger income tax, so that the usual revenues of the Government may be expended upon our needed internal improvements. [Applause.]

We are to be called upon to expend extra millions for the Army and Navy in preparedness. When is a nation prepared? That nation is best prepared when it equips itself within for stalwart growth, prosperity, and power. Internal stagnation means national weakness. It is understood that preparedness means an adequate Army and Navy, with ample coast defense and an efficient merchant marine, but it also means good roads, good schools, rural mail routes, improved waterways and drainage, scientific agriculture, rural credits, and adequate public buildings for the conduct of the public business. All the people, regardless of class or position, have the same right to enjoy these blessings. My conception of preparedness includes these internal activities to give meaning and force to our national life. As we grow strong within we become more truly the leading world power.

This good-roads bill, directing the Department of Agriculture to expend \$25,000,000 annually in road building and road maintenance, in cooperation with the State highway departments, deals with one of the important factors in national preparedness. The General Government has constitutional power to construct and maintain post roads, military roads, and roads used in the transportation of interstate commerce. On the general principle that the greater contains the lesser, it follows that the General Government should aid the States in the construction and maintenance of such roads.

As a member of the House Committee on Roads, which committee has studied this subject and worked faithfully upon it for three years, I appeal to you, my colleagues, to pass the bill now by such an overwhelming majority that the Senate of the United States, where a similar bill died in the Sixty-third Congress, may respond to the sentiment of the country and pass the bill without delay, so that it may become effective in this year 1916. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] says that the purpose of this bill is to aid the farmers. Well, even if that were the sole purpose of this measure, it would not be an ignoble, or unworthy one. I know of no class of our people who are more deserving of aid than the farmers of the country, or who have received less at the hands of Congress in the way of special legislation. [Applause.] Some gentlemen seem to think that all of our appropriations should be confined to the big cities. In their view it is entirely proper to construct magnificent public buildings in those cities, and expend gigantic sums from the public revenues in dredging deeper the harbors of our port towns. This, in their judgment, is wise legislation and profound statesmanship. But as soon as some Member from a country district seeks to advance rural conditions, and spend a little money for the improvement of the country roads, these same gentlemen oppose such a bill with great vehemence, insisting that it is unconstitutional, and impolitic. A proposition to expend a thousand millions of dollars on a needless increase in our military establishment is hailed with delight, while a bill to expend a meager twenty-five millions on farmers' roads is denounced as a pork barrel. Well the fellows that have been enjoying the fat sides, and plump hams of the past, ought not to begrudge the farmers a few spareribs, and backbones. The Congress has expended many millions upon projects far less meritorious than the great cause of better roads for the farmers. It has expended since 1878, over \$650,000,000 on rivers, and harbors. It has expended over \$400,000,000 on the Panama Canal, and the end is not yet in sight. We donated over 197,000,000 acres of splendid land in the West toward the building of the transcontinental railways.

The farmers have been very patient. "They pay a very large part of the revenues of the Government that go into the Federal Treasury, a larger part in proportion to their wealth than any other class of our citizens. They have received in

return from the Federal Government in the way of appropriations for their benefit, less than any other class. Uncomplainingly, year after year, and decade after decade, they have seen their millions go by the way of Federal appropriations, to the aid of rivers and harbors, for the erection of great and imposing buildings in the cities, for elaborate and expensive coast defenses, for the citizens on the seaboard, and for a thousand other purposes." To crown it all, the men who are advocating a billion-dollar military program, begrudge them this pittance.

Permit me on the part of the committee to reply briefly to one or two of the criticisms that our friend from Massachusetts has directed against this bill. One of them is his objection to our definition of a rural post road. For that definition we rely upon the following provision of the Revised Statutes:

All public roads and highways while kept up, and maintained as such, are hereby declared to be post roads.

If this citation does not furnish ample authority for the definition used in our bill, then I am unable to draw a correct conclusion, or fairly interpret a comparatively simple statute.

One other objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts was that in making the apportionment between the States, we took into account the population of the cities. I admit that our scheme of apportionment is purely arbitrary, but I insist that no other scheme than an arbitrary one can be adopted. However, did the gentleman who complains that we have taken into consideration the urban population in the several States, have in mind that the very purpose we had in view in including this population, was to be fair to States like Massachusetts, and New York, with their great cities of Boston, and New York. So with respect to the great urban populations in other States, they too with a view to being fair, were included for the purposes of apportionment. The rest of us would be more than willing to have the gross appropriation divided between the States upon a basis which would eliminate the population of the great cities. Such a scheme of division would be greatly to our advantage. Yet our friend is complaining of a provision that was inserted for his benefit, and for the benefit of other States similarly situated. This illustrates the unreasonable character of his opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House this evening with an argument in favor of good roads designed to present in detail the benefits that will inevitably flow from a universal system of improved highways. I take it for granted that in this age of the world's civilization there is no need to advance such a contention. A universal consensus of judgment in favor of improved highways may be taken for granted. It was an unfair criticism on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts to intimate that the friends of this measure present it as a cure for all the ills of the body politic. We do nothing of the sort. We make no such claim in its behalf. We believe that this measure is a well digested, well worked out, and rational plan to mobilize a portion of the resources of the entire country in aid of domestic development. Further, we expect to satisfy the most exacting critic of this measure that the interests of the Federal Treasury are adequately safeguarded, and that every precaution has been taken to guarantee that the Federal contribution in aid of road construction, will be wisely, economically, and judiciously expended. As guardians of the Federal Treasury we should surround the expenditure of Federal money with appropriate protective provisions. This we have done. The gentleman from Massachusetts belongs to the school of thought that in its day objected to river and harbor development, on the ground that there was no warrant of Federal authority for such work. This objection has long since been abandoned, and if the gentleman was not such a belated representative of an ancient school of strict constructionists, he would know that in this House at least, the time has passed when it is necessary for an advocate of a measure of this character to present arguments for his contention that there is full warrant of constitutional authority for Federal appropriations in aid of the construction, improvement, and maintenance of post roads. [Applause.] The authority to enact this legislation is so fully afforded by the Constitution, that it is no longer open to question, or challenge. But two needful things remain for us to establish on behalf of this measure, and they are, First: Would a universal system of road development in the United States be helpful to the general interests of the entire country? On this proposition, as I have said, we are all agreed. Second: Having in mind the results intended to be secured, is this a bill that will efficiently secure those results? Our bill will be justly criticized, if it is open to the charge that it is so loosely, or carelessly drawn, that the money proposed to be appropriated, may be wastefully, or extravagantly expended. Such however is not the case.

The Members of this body who were here two years ago, and voted for the bill of that session, will recognize that this bill is in large measure along the same lines. It contains the same general principle of Federal aid, but I think I may say to those who voted for the former measure, that the present bill is a better phrased and better balanced bill than its predecessor, and one that will more thoroughly meet the objections of the gentlemen who opposed that bill on the ground that the interests of the General Government were not sufficiently protected. I desire to point out to you that if we have erred in any respect in this measure, it has been along the line of giving too much authority to a Federal department. Still, I do not apprehend that this power will be abused.

We have not included in the present bill that portion of the former bill which divided the roads into classes, and provided a fixed amount to be paid on the roads in each class, contingent on the maintenance by the States of those roads to the standards prescribed. That section was most vehemently assailed in the last session of Congress, and we have eliminated it entirely, without admitting however that these objections were well taken. At any rate we have removed a stumbling block, and rock of offense to a portion at least of our membership.

It was also urged by gentlemen in opposition in the last House, that it was possible for some smaller unit than the State to take up with the Federal department a project of road development, or road maintenance. We have always denied that there was anything in the former bill which in any wise justified this contention, but to meet all objection on this line, we have recast our language in such fashion that this contention is now impossible. It is made absolutely clear that when the Government is approached with respect to a project, either of maintenance, improvement, or construction, it must be approached by the road commission of a State, or its equivalent, as provided by the bill. Since I have been a Member of this body I have seen the full development of popular approval of this principle of Federal aid to roads. Today the great bulk of the States are equipped with road commissions, and these commissions are actively advocating the principle of this bill. Moreover the committee appointed by the National Association of Highway Commissioners, to collaborate and cooperate with your House committee, has given the express stamp of their approval to the pending measure.

I may say further that the Agricultural Department which, on behalf of the Federal Government, will be charged with certain large duties in connection with the execution of this measure, has likewise indorsed the plan of aid reported by your committee, so that this bill comes before you with the favor of the highway commissioners, the favor of the Agricultural Department, and practically the unanimous indorsement of your House committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For how many years has the Roads Committee considered this question upon testimony and by meetings?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is the second bill that the Committee on Roads has reported.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For how many years?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This particular committee was created two years ago. It was established in response to an insistent demand on the part of the country, and of the House, that a committee should be created that could adequately deal with this great subject matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That committee reported this bill unanimously, with the exception of one member.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. I am in sincere sympathy with the purposes of Federal aid to good roads; but I should like to know what there is in the criticism of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that the Federal Government will have no authority or jurisdiction over the roads after the money has been appropriated and expended upon them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The statement of fact is correct, but the criticism based upon the fact is unfounded. That provision was deliberately inserted in the bill to meet objections that came from all over the country to the effect that if the Federal Government retained jurisdiction over these roads, such retention would introduce perplexing questions of conflicting jurisdiction between the Federal Government, and the States. The com-

mittee was overwhelmingly opposed to Federal jurisdiction over the highways proposed to be aided under the provisions of this bill. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the Federal Government will have no jurisdiction over the roads aided, after the money is once expended in that direction. But this provision should be the subject of commendation, not of criticism.

May I go a step further in the discussion of this bill? We invoke the fullest inquiry into its general purpose, and legislative provisions, and I hope to be able to answer satisfactorily the questions of the friends of this measure who may not be clearly advised as to some of its provisions. At the same time I shall endeavor to repel the criticisms of those who oppose it, either in whole, or in part. But while we believe in the general principle presented, we are not wedded to any particular form of language designed to make that principle effective. As I said, if a project of road development is desired to be submitted by a State, that State approaches the Federal Government through its road commission.

In other words, the unit is the State. The representative of that commission presents the project to the Agricultural Department, giving a sufficient outline of the improvement desired to enable the experts of the Agricultural Department to determine in advance whether the proposition is, or is not, meritorious. Then if the department is inclined to think that the proposition thus presented is meritorious, and worthy of aid out of that proportion of the general fund which is segregated for that particular State, it may call upon the State to furnish further information, and such data, estimates, and plans as will enable the experts of the department to determine the cost of construction, and the full merits of the project, in a word to determine in relation to the case submitted everything that the Federal department ought to know before reaching its conclusions.

Having advanced thus far, if the department approves the project as a whole, the State is authorized to proceed with the work. When the work is concluded, and it is ascertained by the Federal department through its appropriate agents, that the work has been done according to the plans approved by its experts, then the department may make payment of the sum which has been decided upon for this particular project of road construction, improvement, or maintenance. Will any gentleman on this floor suggest that up to this point there is anything of authority lacking to the Federal Government to enable it to safeguard the expenditure of its money, or to compel the construction of the improvements contemplated, upon the terms agreed on between the contracting sovereignties?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a provision in the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay money to the States from time to time as the work progresses.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture could not pay the money until the work was completed and approved.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should have completed my statement by adding that if, in the progress of the work, it was developed that the same was being done in conformity with the prescribed requirements, the department could make such payments as it chose to make, not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the work already done. But this is a question of discretion in the Government. It is not compellable to make these pro rata payments.

Mr. MADDEN. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a further question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Virginia enlighten the committee on the question of the advisability of clothing the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to say whether 20, 30, 40, or 50 per cent of the cost shall be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have fixed those limits—between 30 and 50 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Whatever it may be.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have given him that discretion.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask the gentleman what he thinks of the wisdom of that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Personally I would prefer to fix a flat amount of 50 per cent, but the flexible provision was put in to meet the objections that might be urged on the ground that for some work 50 per cent of aid would be too much, and for other work under different conditions, 30 per cent would be too little.

Mr. MADDEN. May I ask one more question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Virginia believe that with that large discretionary power in the hands of the

Secretary of Agriculture, sooner or later political influences will be used upon the Secretary of Agriculture to induce him to pay 50 per cent where only 30 per cent ought to be paid, and 30 per cent where 50 per cent should be paid, and that a political scandal will ensue as the result of that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not a bit of it. The payments in one State do not concern any State in the Union save the one interested. The amount of money that will go to a State is fixed in advance. The exercise of the Secretary's discretion in aiding the roads of a State, will not increase the aggregate of the allowance for that State, or diminish the respective quotas of the other States.

The Secretary need not make these pro rata payments. They are entirely within the discretion of a Federal official. This provision is another illustration of the painstaking care exercised by the committee to safeguard the Federal interests.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In response to the gentleman from Illinois the gentleman from Virginia stated that under the bill the Secretary of Agriculture could make a partial payment. Is it not true, though, that even that partial payment by the Secretary of Agriculture can not be made unless it shall be shown that in no case it exceeds the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put upon the road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. And as I said, the Secretary need not make these pro rata payments. These payments are entirely within the discretion of a Federal official. This provision is another illustration of the painstaking care exercised by the committee to safeguard the Federal interests.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I beg the pardon of the gentleman, but I want to make plain, if I can, a point which I think has been misunderstood. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] unintentionally misinterpreted the clause of the bill which was referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. These partial payments, if any, can "in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance"—by the State, of course.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, and as I insist again, the Federal Government is not even required to make these partial payments.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I have looked over this bill in rather a rapid way, and I do not find that it would cover an instance of this kind. In California we have carried out these advanced conditions to a remarkable degree. We have raised by a bond issue something like \$18,000,000, and spent it in less than four or five years. We have spent it on a program by which the counties were to contribute almost half that amount; so I should say, without the figures before me, that we have spent \$40,000,000 on improvements of roads within the last four or five years. The question I want to ask the gentleman is, Does your bill cover a case of this kind where, as I say, California and the counties have expended so much money; that is, will the amount provided in this bill be apportioned to California, and can California let it lie to its credit in the Treasury until such time as they can use it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, it must be a working capital, so to say. It must be put to work. But I wish to call the gentleman's attention in this connection, because it is one of the most valuable features of our bill, to the fact that it does not interfere with the domestic road policy of any State. Each State can use its pro rata fund in a way to work out its problem according to its own conception, so as to promote the best interests of road development in that State. Of course the road to be constructed must be one of the approved types prescribed by the bill, and the work must be done under the supervision of the State commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

The gentleman advises us that California has completed a large mileage of roads, something very much to the credit of that State, but these roads must be maintained. A State that fails to provide a maintenance fund, does not meet the situation, and the maintenance fund of your State will be very large. California can utilize her pro rata part of the general fund for the maintenance of the roads which she has already completed.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman's construction of the bill is that it provides for maintenance?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, it says so expressly. Look at the title.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Has there been any estimate made as to what increase there will be for the number of employees and

overhead charges that would be incurred by the Department of Agriculture in the distribution?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, you can not well make that estimate at this time. No preliminary estimate has been made as yet. The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall retain in his hands a sum sufficient to provide the necessary expert assistants.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. I want to know whether or not the Federal Government will contribute any part of this money to the roads that have been already constructed; will this go to the maintenance of roads over which the Federal Government has had no jurisdiction?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. The gentleman will see that by looking to the title of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. The bill proposes to expend not exceeding \$25,000,000 per year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Suppose the State should in a given year not expend quite all of that to which it was entitled under the bill; can it save that up on the treasurer's books?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It remains to the credit of the State until it is returned to the Treasury under the covering-in statute. I think that time is two years.

Mr. ROGERS. Then a State could not roll up for a period of five years the amounts due it, and use it for an elaborate system of highways?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia with whom rests the final determination as to the material that enters into the road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The State submits its plans and propositions to the department at Washington. I said a moment ago that if the bill erred in anything it was in giving too much veto power to the Agricultural Department. The State is entitled under this bill to build any prescribed type of road that it prefers. In one locality it may build a concrete road, in another a macadam road, in another a sand clay road, in still another a dirt road of approved type. The State is compelled to present its proposition to the Federal department. If it satisfies that department that the proposed improvement is meritorious, the work is begun, but if it fails to satisfy the department, that particular project must be dropped.

Mr. KING. The final determination rests with the Federal department at Washington?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, it can put a veto on any proposition that the State submits. I submit that under this bill it will be impossible to expend the money of the Government wastefully and extravagantly, unless the Agricultural Department is corrupt, or inefficient.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under this bill I understand in the process of the work the Government can make partial payment before the whole of the road is completed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, a pro rata part of the value of the work completed up to that time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Whether or not the road is completed through a county or township or a subdivision of the State and completed to the satisfaction of the State highway authorities, full payment could be made for that subdivision.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, pro rata payments in the discretion of the department may be made on any work under construction.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I notice that section 1 of the bill undertakes to define what a rural post road shall be. It says for the purposes of this act the term rural post road shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs, and so forth. It seems to me that is subject to the construction that it could not be placed upon any rural road or post road that does not extend out of a city of that size.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think not.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Should not you change that clause so that it would read to public roads outside of incorporated cities of that size?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will say just this. The committee is not enamored of any particular phrasing. If the

gentleman will prepare his amendment and submit it, and on consideration it appears that the bill is justly amenable to the criticism he makes, there will be no difficulty in having his amendment adopted by the committee.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I understand what the committee intended to express was that rural post roads shall include any road outside of a city of 2,000 inhabitants, and so forth.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I suggest to the gentleman that he prepare his amendment and submit it. There will be no difficulty about accepting any amendment that improves the bill.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] objected to the bill because, according to his idea, great agricultural States of the West would get a benefit from it over what States in the East would get?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that one of the causes of the high cost of living is the cost of taking the farm products from the farm to the consumer?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is true.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that with good roads the cost of delivering farm products to the market, and to the consumer is reduced from 30 to 75 per cent?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct in his statement.

Mr. HELGESEN. The State of South Dakota, to which he referred as a small unit of less than three-quarters of a million people, undoubtedly hauls 10 times the tonnage that the farmers of the State of Massachusetts do, all of which is food products. If you can reduce the cost of taking those products to the market, it will inure to the benefit of the consumer, of which he is one.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Unquestionably. So far as the criticism of the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, I do not think it is a serious one, and answering it in a sort of ad hominem way, I would say that the agricultural States that are without harbors have heretofore been paying their full part of the money that has gone to those States where there are harbors, and where costly harbor improvements have been constructed, as in Massachusetts for instance.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice the gentleman said in answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] that the State could use those funds in any way it saw fit, so far as expenditure on any road is concerned. In other words, if a State had a system of crossroads or interstate highways, it could use its portion of the fund upon that system.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Absolutely, and upon any one road in that system.

Mr. BORLAND. And, on the contrary, if it had simply rural roads or local post roads, it could use the money for the maintenance of that class of roads?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And that the initiative came from the State?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, and the veto from the Federal Government.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear in my own mind about this matter. Do I understand that the difference between this money that will be given to these States and the expenditure of Federal funds ordinarily is that after the Government has finally paid the money into this road fund it forever has lost all jurisdiction over the roads through which it goes, while in all other public improvements it maintains some control?

Mr. SAUNDERS. All jurisdiction under this act. If the United States has any jurisdiction otherwise, by virtue of any provision, or section of the Constitution, that jurisdiction is not sought to be interfered with, and could not be interfered with, by this act. But under this act, the Government does not take any jurisdiction as the result of the expenditure of its money under the oversight of the Agricultural Department.

We consider that the Federal Government gets value received for that expenditure in the benefits that will inure to the entire country from this application of a portion of the Federal funds.

Mr. MEEKER. May I ask if this is not the only project of that sort whereby the Government gives its money away and thereafter has no control whatever?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not prepared to say, but I will admit it, *pro arguendo*. The statement, if true does not detract at all from the merits of the proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the Government contributes money to the departments of agriculture of the various States and retains no control over those departments?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, yes; all of the land grant colleges are aided in that way. That in itself is a sufficient answer to Mr. MEEKER's question. As I said, I am willing to admit that this proposition stands single and alone in the above respect, but that does not impeach its merits.

I wish to make reply to one further objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and in this respect I speak from practical experience. I refer in this connection to the inquiry propounded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]. The facts that I will cite will show how mere theory must be rejected in the light of actual experience. The gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from Massachusetts if he did not think that, if this bill went into effect, it would nullify the local spirit of road development, and lay a blight upon the present eager spirit of highway improvement existing throughout the United States. The gentleman from Massachusetts very promptly and enthusiastically agreed that it would. It happens that in the State of Virginia we operate under a system that is precisely analogous to the system that is proposed in this bill; and so far from having paralyzed the zeal of local endeavor, it has been a most helpful aid to road development in our Commonwealth.

Permit me to illustrate the workings of the Virginia system. If a county in that State desires to secure aid from the Commonwealth, it submits its proposition to the State highway commission. That commission sends its engineer to the county concerned. He investigates the project, determines its merit, and reports to Richmond. If the project is approved as meritorious, the highway department causes a survey to be made, and prepares plans. Then it says in substance to the county, "Build this road according to these plans, and when the road is completed we will pay one-half of the cost, out of your quota, as heretofore ascertained." I wish to say that this has been a decidedly helpful policy in aid of the development of good roads in Virginia. With that experience confronting me, I am able to answer, as I have said, from actual knowledge, the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas, and assert with confidence that the pending bill would give a mighty impulse to road development in the entire continental United States.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, if it is not a fact that his own State of Virginia has more miles of unimproved road in proportion to its mileage than any other State in the Union, or had last year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be so. The State of Virginia has not been so fortunately situated with respect to its financial affairs, as the State from which the gentleman comes.

The Civil War left us prostrate in every way, and burdened with a heavy ante-bellum State debt. Crippled, wounded, oppressed with the problems of reconstruction, the Commonwealth of Virginia heroically undertook to pay a large portion of the indebtedness incurred before it was dismembered, and trampled under foot by marching armies. Bowed down under the burden of that indebtedness, which is as yet unpaid, we are open to the ungenerous reproach of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We admit that with better fortune and more ample means, Massachusetts has far exceeded us in the direction of road development. Still, we have not been altogether remiss in this matter, as the following figures will show:

Total amount of bonds issued by the counties for road making between July 1, 1906, and September 30, 1915, \$7,151,100.

Number of miles of macadam and other roads constructed under the supervision of the highway commission during the above period, 3,762.49 miles.

Number of counties in which work was carried on under the supervision of the highway commission during the year ending September 15, 1915, 97 counties.

Total road mileage under construction in the above year by the commission, 846.55 miles.

Cost of same, \$1,893,190.

This work is continually growing.

Mr. SIMS. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I notice in the bill that the amount is limited to \$25,000,000 per year.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. That, of course, will not bind any future Congress.
Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course not.

Mr. SIMS. Further, would it not be rather in the way of development? Would it not practically require the States of the whole Union not to take more than \$25,000,000 a year unless they could participate in the fund?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The scheme of this bill is as equitable a system of distribution as I believe can be worked out. I have already called the attention of the gentlemen who clamorously insist that certain great tax paying States, as they describe them, will contribute an unequal proportion of this money, to the fact that those same great tax paying States will receive by far the greater proportion of the fund to be expended under this bill. The State of New York will get something like a million and a half, out of this \$25,000,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I approve of this bill as a whole; and I want to say, too, what the gentleman said in regard to the working of the law in Virginia is true as to the working of a similar law in Michigan.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am very glad to have the support of the gentleman's experience.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Appropriations have been made by the Legislature of Michigan to pay State awards for the construction of roads, to assist communities in building roads, and to encourage the building of roads by the communities.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. There was some criticism because the Federal Government is asked to contribute large sums of money and was to have no control whatever over the road after it is built. Would it not be wise or proper to have inserted in this bill a provision to the effect that no road which is built or improved by contribution of Federal money shall ever be made a toll road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, I am not prepared to say at this moment whether that would be a wholesome limitation, but I do not reject the suggestion. Of course I am not in a position to accept it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There are not as many toll roads as there used to be, but in some States I guess there are some now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are some in Virginia.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. So as to be sure they would be used always for the general benefit and not for private profit. Some of these roads have tollgates maintained by private interests. Would it not be wise to have a provision that no road which was constructed or maintained, or on which Federal money had been expended, could be made a toll road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I say, that is a suggestion that is well worthy of consideration and discussion, but I am not prepared just now, speaking for myself, to say that I accept it. Of course I do not reject it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia has expressed his doubt as to whether the State of New York would be willing to expend a sum equivalent to that allotted to it under this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did not suggest that. I said I doubted whether the contribution in the way of taxes which the State of New York will contribute to the fund of \$25,000,000 would be as much as the amount that it will receive under this bill. It may, or it may not. I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the gentleman if he is aware that the expenditures in the State of New York in the year 1913 for highways was \$13,820,000?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did not know the figures, but I knew that the State of New York had made great expenditures upon its roads in recent years. New York is a very rich State. I wonder whether this money came from the rural communities where it was expended, or mainly from the great municipalities.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the gentleman to challenge it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I did not challenge it. You were complaining with respect to the appropriation for this Federal road fund that the big, rich States would pay an unjust and disproportionate amount. I simply said that under this \$25,000,000 apportionment the State of New York would get something like \$1,500,000, and I doubted if the amount she would pay in the way of taxes to make up the fund of \$25,000,000 would amount to \$1,500,000. I do not know whether it would, or not. It is immaterial.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. I favor the general purpose of this legislation, but the gentleman has asked for criticism—

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. We desire to work out a well-guarded bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Suppose the Appropriation Committee, having discretion to appropriate all the way from one cent to millions of dollars, should in view of the condition of the Treasury say that they would appropriate only \$5,000,000 a year, does the gentleman think this would be a fair arrangement among the States to give them, first, the arbitrary factor of \$65,000 and divide the other differentials in accordance with the scope of the bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. If the gentleman can work out a more equitable plan, present it in the way of an amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. Suppose, for instance, they would appropriate \$4,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000, it would all be distributed, would it not, on the first fixed factor?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think it a wise proposition to leave it in that form?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I do not think any State should receive less than \$65,000, because we did not consider that a less sum than that could be economically administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the several States. That was the reason for arbitrarily setting aside \$65,000. An amendment might make it \$25,000 or \$50,000, or whatever was decided upon.

Mr. GORDON rose.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. I wish to inquire whether or not the gentleman from Virginia really believes there is any close analogy, or any analogy at all, between the relations existing between the several States and their several political subdivisions, townships, and counties, and relations between the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Suppose I answer no?

Mr. GORDON. Then I contend your illustration very far fetched, because—

Mr. SAUNDERS. My illustration would not fail at all, because it is not dependent upon the exact character of the relationship. It was given merely to illustrate the manner in which these subdivisions would approach the superior authority. It does not make any difference what the relationship may be. In the relation between the State, and the county, the State has supervision of this project to see that the State money is justly expended in the counties. Under this bill the Department of Agriculture will see that the amount of money that the Government of the United States puts into a project in a State is adequately and properly expended in that State. We need not go into any technical quibbling about the exact character of the relationship under the Federal Constitution between the States, and the Government, as compared with the relation between the States, and the counties.

Mr. GORDON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the different subdivisions of the State the money is spent under State supervision, and the State has absolute control.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Under this bill every dollar will be controlled and expended under the supervision of the Federal Government, so far as the Federal Government contributes a dollar toward any individual project.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that the enactment of this bill will make unnecessary the continuance of the emergency-tax law or war-tax act?

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are some questions I do not think ought to be asked, because they imply a reflection upon the intelligence either of the gentleman who asks them, or of the gentleman of whom they are asked. [Applause.] I do not care to make any other answer to the question.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman does not care to answer that question I would like to ask if he knows the proportion which the State of New York pays of the taxes levied under the emergency-tax law?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. I am entirely indifferent as to that. If New York pays a large proportion of those taxes, that fact merely shows that her people have prospered more than the rest of the country. That is all. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. And that is the reason you want to enforce this additional burden upon them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is not a bad reason. If you suggest it as a reason I will accept the suggestion.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the matter of the Federal Government contributing money for the construction of roads in a State and having nothing to do with the use of the money, or the question of what control the Government should have along the line of inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon],

I will say there is precedent for this kind of expenditure, and this proposed character of regulation, under the Lever law, under which money is contributed by the Federal Government for use by the State for farm management and farm demonstration.

The law requires that the agricultural college of the State shall submit a proposition, or rather a plan of operation, for the next succeeding year to the Department of Agriculture, and that plan shall be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Then the money is turned over bodily to the agricultural college, and the agricultural college expends it as it sees fit. It reports to the Secretary of Agriculture the manner in which the money has been expended, and thereafter money can be withheld if the money already received, or before that time received, was not properly expended. It is about on the line of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. With respect to the payment of taxes, the rich man in New York pays in proportion to what he owns, the rich man in Virginia does likewise. If there are more rich men in New York than in Virginia, then they are just that much better off than we are, and we do not begrudge them their good fortune. But if they have more, they ought to pay more, under any equitable system of taxation. The State contributes to build roads in Virginia, but we do not aid a single city with respect to its streets, although the cities of Virginia pay a large proportion of the road tax. I do not know of any system of taxation under which the expenditures in a community are limited to the taxes paid by that community.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the amount of taxes coming from these different States. Did not the committee itself make a part of the report those very lists so as to invite attention and discussion on the floor?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; and I tried to point out that the argument of my friend from Massachusetts was for that reason not well founded, and that the figures as to urban population that he criticizes, were deliberately put into the report by the committee, so that it would be readily seen that each State would receive a proper proportion of this road fund under the proposed scheme of distribution.

Is there a better scheme of distribution? Certainly the proportion of roads in the States which are used by the Federal Government in the transportation of its mails—and that is becoming an increasing proportion year by year—is a just factor for the purpose of determining the apportionment under this bill. Certainly the number of people in a State that will use the roads to be aided, is a just factor in considering the question of the amount to be expended in that State. Hence we have considered both road mileage, and population, in the solution of the problem. Whatever inequality may be done by one factor of the apportionment, we think is measurably corrected by the other.

If anyone on this floor can work out a juster system of apportionment than that which has been worked out by the committee, I would be glad if he would submit it. I think the system adopted by the committee is entirely fair, and it is precisely the system that the House last year favored by a vote of about 7 to 1 on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Would it not be a good plan to take the number of automobiles owned as a basis?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, if the gentleman wishes, he can put his suggestion in the form of an amendment, and submit it.

Now, one word with reference to my State. While the State of Virginia is not, for the reasons that I have mentioned, as bountifully supplied with good roads as other States more fortunately situated with respect to their financial resources, I wish to say that we are not as badly off as the figures of State construction would indicate. The greater proportion of the roads in Virginia are built by the counties. We have counties in the State of Virginia which have bonded themselves for road purposes in amounts running from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. The roads in those counties are just as good roads as those in the State of my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman may have the information. There is a road running from Washington down to Virginia. How much has the General Government contributed toward the building of that road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know. I expect my friend is better apprised as to the facts of that case than I am.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not know what the amount is, but I know that the General Government has contributed some. I do not know just on what excuse it was, but I suspect—

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, that was possibly a road leading to Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. MANN. No; way down into Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To Mount Vernon, possibly?

Mr. MANN. No; not that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To the Government experimental farm beyond the Potomac, perhaps.

Mr. MANN. No; they have a road leading to Alexandria and down in that neighborhood.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, anything that would help Alexandria would be justified, I reckon. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. Anything which would help the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] would meet my approval, and I have no doubt that this is what caused them perhaps to call it the "Carlin Road"—for the reason that he had gotten this money out of the Treasury.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What I have said with respect to road construction in Virginia was merely by the way. The counties of Virginia in the last few years, particularly under the impulse of the system of State aid that now prevails there, have expended many million dollars in the betterment of our roads.

Pass this bill and we will spend many millions more. I submit this measure to the House committee, fully believing that we have worked out a measure that will meet the just expectations of every advocate of road development in the United States; a bill which is in aid of the interests of all the people in all the States. I do not stop to measure the benefits that it will confer, or forecast its beneficent influence, for no man can measure the benefits that will accrue to our entire country, from the establishment of such a system of highways as this bill contemplates. I submit this bill to you in the full confidence that it is justly conceived, adequately framed, and destined to accomplish great results of betterment in every State of the Union. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition, and will then yield to the gentleman from Missouri to move that the committee rise.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We will take care of the gentleman from Illinois in the morning. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 610).

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, the date of the approval of the Alaskan Railroad act (38 Stat., 305), to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The message is referred to the Committee on the Territories and ordered printed, without the accompanying documents.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 14, 1916:

H. R. 136. An act granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois.

H. R. 4717. An act to authorize Butler County, Mo., to construct a bridge across Black River.

On January 17, 1916:

S. 2409. An act to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLARK of Florida, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CONRY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ANDERSON, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the following cases, no adverse reports having been made thereon:

Thomas O'Reilly (H. R. 7626), Sixty-third Congress;

Louisa M. Salim (H. R. 2185), Sixty-second Congress;

Louisa M. Sabin (H. R. 16351), Sixty-third Congress;

Lucie Bostian (H. R. 2186), Sixty-third Congress;

John Brin (H. R. 4625), Sixty-third Congress;

Melissa J. Gross (H. R. 7311), Sixty-third Congress;

George W. Bryant (H. R. 3423), Sixty-third Congress; and

Benjamin F. Dayton (H. R. 7318), Sixty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request: Mr. Moss of West Virginia asks permission to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies thereof, the papers in connection with the claim of Mrs. Harvey Sayre (H. R. 7136, 63d Cong.), upon which adverse action was taken by the Committee on Claims. (Rept. No. 442, Mar. 23, 1914, by Mr. Mott, from the Committee on Claims.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to this request?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does that come from the Committee on Claims?

The SPEAKER. It is presented by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MANN. It is quite customary to grant leave to withdraw papers where no adverse report has been made, but this is a case where an adverse report has been made. It seems to me some one on the Committee on Claims ought to give attention to the matter before the request is granted. I shall not object at this time, but I think they ought to know about it.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. On the 6th of December House joint resolution 14, laying an embargo on arms, ammunition, and submarines, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A change of reference is asked to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a petition and brief in support of a bill that I introduced to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a petition and brief in support of a bill which he introduced to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman seems to have rather a formidable looking document in his hand. What good will it do to print it in the Record, in fine print, which nobody will read? The committee before which the matter is pending can order it printed if it desires to. It is not customary to print the briefs of lawyers or of other people in the Record. I hope the gentleman will find out what he can get the committee to do before asking to put it in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the bureau of safety labor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, it is said that time at last sets all things even, and Goldsmith poetically argues that the blessings of Heaven to all mankind are about distributed equally. So it is with the conduct of the able gentleman who refers the bills in this House to the different committees. He manages to give to the committee of which I am chairman about as many bills to which the committee is not entitled as it takes away from its proper jurisdiction and gives to other committees. In point is the one just transferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is another bill, which I introduced myself, proposing an amendment to a law enacted on the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in the last session of Congress. The bill ought to go to that committee instead of to my committee. I have not the bill in my hand, but I will get the bill and the number and give it to the proper clerk, and I ask unanimous consent that the reference be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman must have the number of the bill and not take any chances.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is the only bill that I introduced to correct the Panama bill at the last session.

Mr. MANN. I know what the bill is; I have read the bill. I objected to granting the request because it is such a loose way of doing business. The clerks could never keep track of them.

Mr. ADAMSON. It can not be very loose, because I will get the bill and give the number to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$7,500 for an increase in the salaries of the three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury Department, from \$5,000 to \$7,500 each per annum (H. Doc. No. 595); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an amendment to estimate for salaries, office of the Supervising Architect, as printed on page 38 of the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 596); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an amended estimate of appropriation under "Salaries, office of Quartermaster General," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication of the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$386 for the relief of John E. Jones, an American consul of class 3 (H. Doc. 598); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Knapp Narrows, Md., with a view to securing a deeper channel between Tilghman Island and the mainland (H. Doc. No. 599); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Delaware River, N. Y., N. J., and Pa., at or near the mouth of

the Neversink River (H. Doc. 600); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on Morris Cove, New Haven Harbor, Conn., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge (H. Doc. 601); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Piscataway Creek, Prince Georges County, Md., and entrance thereto (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Saugatuck Harbor and Kalamazoo River, Mich., with a view to securing increased depth to the town of Douglas (H. Doc. No. 608); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Columbia River at Kennewick, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 603); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting reports of bureau officers concerning typewriters, adding machines, and similar labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year 1915, transmitting a further communication from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, explaining that there were no exchanges of this character in the Manila (P. I.) district during said year (H. Doc. No. 604); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Army, together with a list of leases granted by the Secretary of War during the calendar year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 605); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates in connection with the legislative, executive, and judicial bill (H. Doc. No. 606); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, amending his estimate of appropriation on page 43 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917, for "Salaries, office of Comptroller of the Currency" (H. Doc. No. 607); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer, submitting urgent estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 609); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII:

Mr. KEY of Ohio, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 54) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 59), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2202) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Benjamin; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3844) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Kerlee; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6330) granting a pension to Joseph F. Flynn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7103) granting an increase of pension to Willard L. Anthony; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Edward A. Ward; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7472) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bruce; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7475) granting an increase of pension to H. R. Watkins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8851) granting a pension to John Zanger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9409) to repeal sections 35 to 49, inclusive, of the act of June 13, 1898, concerning mixed flour, as amended by the act of March 2, 1901, and as further amended by the act of April 12, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9410) for the erection of a public building at Galva, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9411) to require numbering and recording of undocumented vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9412) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of May 16, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9413) for the erection of a public building at Rushville, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9414) to grant certain holidays to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9415) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows and remarried widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 9417) to fix the price for gas in the District of Columbia and prescribing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9418) authorizing the construction of two wagon bridges across the Umatilla River, in the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 9419) to appropriate money to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to license and inspect warehouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 9420) to transfer the Bureau of Mines to the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 9421) to extend the free-mail privilege to official mail matter of the Organized Militia and Naval Militia of the several States and Territories of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9422) to provide for the construction of a public building at Rock Hill, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9423) for the erection of a public building at Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9424) for the erection of a public building at York, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9425) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the Battle of Cowpens on the 17th day of January, 1781; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9426) for the erection of a public building at Winstonsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9427) for the relief of a certain class of officers on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 9428) relating to procedure in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9429) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United

States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 9430) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9431) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9432) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: A bill (H. R. 9433) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9434) to give a legal status to a dam constructed in the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9435) to prevent the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9436) to amend the provisions of section 12, act of February 8, 1875, as amended by section 2, act of March 1, 1879, and section 3149 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 2, act of March 1, 1879, as to the appointment and bonding of deputy collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 9437) granting pensions to Emergency Men of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: Resolution (H. Res. 98) instructing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate railroad opposition to river and harbor legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 99) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions of transportation to Mount Vernon, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Representatives for a four-year instead of a two-year term; to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FINLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) providing for the printing of the roster of the officers and enlisted men of the Union and Confederate Armies; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) providing for a committee to investigate certain matters relating to the matériel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9438) granting an increase of pension to John Flight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9439) granting a pension to Richard Devers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 9440) granting a pension to Leo F. Raske; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9441) granting a pension to Dorcas A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9442) granting an increase of pension to George E. Roe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9443) granting an increase of pension to John W. Pence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9444) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9445) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9446) for the relief of George Welty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9447) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9448) granting a pension to Claudia E. Geary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9449) for the relief of Axel Jacobson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9451) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9452) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Clevenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 9453) granting a pension to Herman W. Brouel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9454) for the relief of the Cheraw Lyceum, Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9455) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Gardner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9456) granting an increase of pension to Paul Beyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9457) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Gerber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 9458) for the relief of the heirs of Santos Benavides; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9459) for the relief of the heirs of S. P. H. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9460) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua D. Haskett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 9461) vesting jurisdiction in the Court of Claims to entertain the claim of Charles A. Morrison, as administrator de bonis non of the estate of William Morrison, deceased, against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9462) granting a pension to Ellen S. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 9463) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9464) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Wood and the estate of I. T. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9465) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9466) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Charles Johnson and Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9467) granting a pension to Rufus R. Ford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 9468) for the relief of the heir of Wiley Yarborough; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9469) for the relief of the widow of John Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9470) for the relief of the heirs of Henderson C. Rush, Ben Wheeler, and James M. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9471) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9472) for the relief of the heir of Hundley V. Fowler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 9473) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9474) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9475) granting a pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 9476) to authorize the President to award a medal of honor to Dr. John T. Nagle, for conspicuous bravery at the Battle of Kernstown, Virginia, on July 24, 1864, while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 9477) granting a pension to Violetta Wyckoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9478) for the relief of John Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9479) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of R. W. Harris, administrator of James P. Harris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 9480) granting an increase of pension to Millard I. Nettleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9481) granting an honorable discharge to Larkin T. Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9482) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Assmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9483) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9484) granting an increase of pension to Jeannie Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9485) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9486) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Feldkamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9487) to remove the charge of desertion against James McGinnis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 9488) granting an increase of pension to Robert Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9489) granting an increase of pension to Henry Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9490) granting an increase of pension to Erastus P. Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9492) granting a pension to Poppy H. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 9493) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9494) granting a pension to Katie Noblitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9495) granting an increase of pension to Abby J. Cadwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 9496) granting a pension to William D. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9497) granting a pension to William B. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9498) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9499) granting a pension to Sarah E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 9500) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to readjudicate the cases of Mattie W. Jackson, widow, and others against The United States and Mattie E. Hughes against The United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 9501) to correct the military record of James M. Wiley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9502) granting an increase of pension to Warren E. McIntyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 9503) granting an increase of pension to James D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9504) granting a pension to William Couture, or Goodhue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 9505) granting a pension to Isaac Hammett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9506) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9507) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9508) granting a pension to Sue M. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9509) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Beery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9510) granting a pension to Cale Trippett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 9511) granting a pension to Victoria Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9512) granting a pension to Cassie Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9513) granting an increase of pension to Conrad L. Westerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9514) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Charles P. Phillips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 9515) for the relief of John J. Mangen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 9516) granting a pension to Joseph W. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9517) for the relief of John A. O'Keefe, administrator of estate of William M. O'Keefe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 9518) for the relief of Henry Fuller, administrator of Philo Fuller, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9519) granting an increase of pension to Dallas F. Jarvis; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Waterville (Me.) Defense Society, favoring adoption of the Swiss military plan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of West Lafayette Bank and the Farmers' and Merchants' Bank, of Warsaw, Ohio, protesting against stamp on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALES: Memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse requesting the unconditional repeal of the seamen's act and enactment of a comprehensive law that will develop an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of laborers employed in Pittsburgh (Pa.) post office favoring the classification of laborers in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of Swedish Americans, Friends of Peace, an organization having over 50,000 members, favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Salem (N. J.) Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of W. H. Wade and 50 others, of Plymouth and Sheboygan Counties, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 83 members of the Sheboygan (Wis.) Liquor Dealers' Protective Association, protesting against increase in the tax on beer, wines, liquor, cigars, tobacco, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association at Madison, Wis., favoring passage of House bill 4715 to prevent discrimination in prices and to provide for publicity of prices to dealers and to the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of West Bend (Wis.) Woolen Mills, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of A. V. Morris & Sons and Van Brocklin & Stover, of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring protection to the American manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of board of supervisors of Napa and other California counties, favoring legislation for the preservation of the California oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Brooklyn Teachers' Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of C. K. Gleason, of New York, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Harry D. Wescott, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Church Peace Union, of New York, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany House bill 9267, granting an increase of pension to William F. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of L. S. Olson and 28 others, of Hixton, and J. B. Scheil and 41 others, of Unity, Wis., urging passage of the

Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9268, granting a pension to Mahala Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association, of Beloit, Wis., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of the Franklin Board & Paper Co., of Franklin, Ohio, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Brooklyn Teachers' Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Insulated Wire & Manufacturing Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Earl Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Earlville, Ill., protesting against the tax on mutual insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Motor Club, protesting against a proposed tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of S. D. Warren & Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of L. L. Vincent and others, of Rickreall, Oreg., favoring law abolishing manufacture of intoxicating liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Monthly Meeting of Society of Friends at Flushing, Ohio, and representative committee of the Yearly Meeting of Society of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., and Joseph E. Myers and other citizens, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULBERT: Memorial of Iron Shipbuilders' Co-operative Association and Drillers and Tappers' League, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to more pay for workmen in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 7120, granting a pension to Robert A. Imrie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Boulder (Colo.) Commercial Association, urging the passage of House bill 651 as a measure both fair and equitable to shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., of Chicago, Ill.; Gardiner Hall, Jr., & Co., of South Wilmington, Mass.; and the American Mills Co., of Waterbury, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of sundry citizens of Ahmeek, Mich., favoring exacting full reparation from the Mexican Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the executive board of the Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of James I. Jenks, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 8234, the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Sydney Worsted Co., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of Retail Clothiers' Association, protesting against passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of 147 citizens of Roulette, Pa., protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Union League Club of New York, relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Association of Ex-Deputy Collectors of Internal Revenue, protesting against taking position of internal-revenue collector from under civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the American Institute of Architects, protesting against bill for building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of more than 3,000 citizens of St. Louis City and County, Mo., favoring passage of a bill for improvement of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Paul Bertrand, Charles G. Mayer, and John Lieb and others, of Philadelphia,

favoring bill to prohibit sale of ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of Lawrence Litchfield, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Petition of sundry business men of Gilbert, Minn., urging passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of Brownsville Paper Co., of Brownsville; Knowlton Bros., of Watertown; G. C. Chauncey and others, of Phoenix and Fulton; and Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 702, for dyestuff tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON: Petitions of merchants in the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of Peter Graff & Co., of Worthington, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKEY (by request): Memorial of New Britain Retail Wine, Liquor, and Beer Dealers' Association, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of German-American Alliance, of Tiffin, Ohio, favoring an embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Santa Clara Camp, No. 111, and Erambert-Case Camp, No. 77, Department of Ohio, Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Sandusky Council, Knights of Columbus, No. 546, favoring the passage of House bill 4699, to make the 12th day of October each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of C. F. Hoag & Co., of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the Merrill Silk Co. and the Merrill Hosiery Co., both of Hornell, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 702, entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of California State Board of Education, favoring Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Lassen County, Cal., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring bill for Federal censorship of motion picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Petitions of John F. Butler, R. J. Sanford, J. R. Weston, T. H. Perrin & Co., C. E. Haywood, H. W. Pearl, Henry Wells Co., W. F. Hinman, Smith & Smith, Scott Mayfield, W. H. Bartholomew, C. W. Kennedy, John A. Dutches, M. Needham, Thomas Woods, E. J. Denney, H. J. Van Ness, F. T. Swan, L. Goldsmith, Whitney & Sackett, Floyd & Morgan, Sullivan & Fobes, Elliott Taylor & Sons, Willis McGee & Co., O. P. Benson, James H. Sullivan, and F. A. Weed, all of Potsdam, N. Y., urging the passage of the Stevens maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Mohawk Valley Paper Co., of Little Falls; Mohawk Valley Cap Factory and Foster Box Board Co., of Utica, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Ashaway (R. I.) Line & Twine Manufacturing Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of J. W. Busiel & Co., of Laconia, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 702, for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions from the citizens of Hotchkiss, Paonia, Cortez, Delta, Durango, Ouray, Telluride, Montrose, Grand Junction, Leadville, Glenwood Springs, Silverton, Gunnison, Mancos, Dolores, Palisade, Kremmling, Hot Sulphur Springs, Steamboat Springs, Yampa, Oak Creek, Hay-

den, Craig, Aspen, Breckenridge, Basalt, New Castle, Silt, Eagle, Redcliff, Minturn, Fruita, Carbondale, Grand Valley, Clifton, De Beque, Rifle, and Olathe, in the fourth congressional district of Colorado, in support of the measure to tax interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Forsythe Dyeing Co., of New Haven, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Parker & Sons Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Coral Manufacturing Co., of Norristown, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy favor and grace and guidance for the duties of this new day. Our duties are ever increasing; our responsibilities are more and more with every coming day. By Thy grace we have erected a great empire and by Thy grace alone shall we be enabled to project the policies which carry out the plans and secure the permanency of our Nation's life, and the development of all its resources. Grant us Thy guidance and blessing as Thou hast given Thy guidance and blessing to the fathers. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFUNDS OF DRAWBACKS (S. DOC. NO. 248).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Senate resolution, dated the 10th instant, directing me to submit to the Senate a statement showing certain data relative to applications for, and payment of, drawbacks under paragraph O, Section IV, of the present tariff act, for various periods.

In reply I have to state that instructions have been given to various collectors of customs to forward the required data to the department, where it will be compiled and submitted to the Senate with the least possible delay. I may add that the clerical labor involved, requiring as it does reference to every drawback transaction in the Customs Service for a period of two and a half years, will consume considerable time, but that the same will be expedited in every possible way.

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, Secretary.

WATER-POWER SITES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 17, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions of Senate resolution No. 544, passed by the Sixty-third Congress, third session, I have the honor to transmit herewith the information in my possession as to the ownership and control of the water-power sites in the United States; showing what proportion of such water-power sites is in private ownership and by what companies and corporations such sites in private ownership are owned and controlled; what horsepower has been developed and what proportion of it is owned and controlled by such private companies and corporations; and facts bearing upon the question as to the existence of a monopoly in the ownership and control of hydroelectric power in the United States.

Respectfully,

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know what to do with the accompanying papers.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the matter be printed as a public document. It contains valuable information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Here it is [indicating].

Mr. MYERS. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, then.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that as the question is being dealt with by the Committee on Commerce it ought to go to that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question of constitutionality is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and also by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. The subject matter, however, is before the Committee on Public Lands. I think the communication and accom-

panying papers ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will go to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 153. An act to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor;

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a letter in the nature of a petition from Hon. A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of Montana, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD with his signature.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA, SECRETARY OF STATE,
Helena, January 14, 1916.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1907 reconnaissance and preliminary surveys were begun upon the Flathead irrigation project in northwestern Montana.

In 1908 a construction upon the project was authorized and the first appropriation made by act of Congress. In 1909 actual construction was begun.

In spite of the fact that since the beginning of actual work in 1909 more than six years have elapsed, the project is now only 22.2 per cent completed.

The Flathead project is the largest and most comprehensive Indian irrigation scheme ever undertaken in the United States. The area of the completed project is about 152,000 acres. There is not the slightest question but what all of these lands would easily pay the water-construction charge of \$45 an acre, or even more, if necessary.

There has been a large amount of settling upon these lands, but the people have found, to their sorrow, that they are unable to make a living without irrigation. They have been led to believe, and were entitled to believe, that the Government of the United States would complete this project.

It never can be completed within the lifetime of a settler now upon the project with such insignificant appropriations as have been made in recent years. A large amount of the work already accomplished will go to pieces and its value will be lost unless the work is pushed to final accomplishment.

The State of Montana is firmly of the opinion that an appropriation of \$1,000,000 should be made for the Flathead project this year of 1916, and we ardently hope that the Congress of the United States will recognize the necessity for such an appropriation.

I have the honor to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present the petition of pupils of the Reservoir Valley School, in Montana, praying for an appropriation for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the name of the first signer and underneath the words "and many others" and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVOIR VALLEY SCHOOLHOUSE.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned, pupils of the Reservoir Valley Schoolhouse, do most urgently and respectfully petition of Congress that an appropriation of not less than \$1,000,000 be passed by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. This schoolhouse is located within the Flathead project and our education will depend to a large extent on the manner that this project is prosecuted.

Respectfully,

VENUS CAFFEY,
(And many others).

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions in the nature of a petition, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.